Library of Princeton
OCT 29 1896
Theological Seminary

Division DA110
Section .I76
No. v.5

SOCIAL ENGLAND

SOCIAL ENGLAND

VOL. I. contains :—*From the Earliest Times to the Accession of Edward I.* Price 15s.

VOL. II. contains : —*From the Accession of Edward I. to the Death of Henry VII.* Price 15s.

VOL. III. contains :—*From the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Elizabeth.* Price 15s.

VOL. IV. contains :—*From the Accession of James I. to the Death of Queen Anne.* Price 17s.

"The history of social England is a stupendous undertaking, and Mr. Traill has realised his heavy responsibilities. Few men are better fitted to edit a work so comprehensive and exhaustive, for his knowledge is exceptionally wide and his intellect is singularly lucid. . . . Naturally it was an important question how so complicated a theme was to be treated: Mr. Traill has decided—as we think, wisely, for what may be defined as an encyclopædical social history. There is methodical classification, with a distribution of the subjects among writers whom we may assume to be specialists."—*The Times.*

"The utility of such a work is obvious, its interest to all cultivated people enormous, and the scale on which the book is to be written, adequate."—*The Speaker.*

"Mr. Traill has, so far as we can judge from this first instalment of his SOCIAL ENGLAND, on the whole been fortunate in procuring the services of a competent band of contributors."—*Saturday Review.*

"SOCIAL ENGLAND is so admirably planned; the experts having charge of several departments are such masters of their subject; it is so excellently prefaced by Mr. Traill, that for a moment the boundary line between an encyclopædia and a history seems illusory, and in this case illuded."—*National Observer.*

VOLUME VI.

WILL CONTAIN

FROM THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO TO THE GENERAL ELECTION OF 1885.

SOCIAL ENGLAND

A Record of the Progress of the People

In Religion Laws Learning Arts Industry Commerce Science Literature and Manners from the Earliest Times to the Present Day

By Various Writers

EDITED BY

H. D. TRAILL, D.C.L.

SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

VOLUME V

FROM THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE I. TO THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

LONDON: CASSELL AND COMPANY, LIMITED

1896

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE AGE OF WALPOLE, 1714–1742: *WITH SOME OF THE PREPARATIONS FOR IT.*

	PAGE
The Character of the Eighteenth Century	1
Political History: Home Politics	2
England and Europe	7
The Army	11
The Navy	19
Exploration, 1642–1742	24
English Law, 1689–1742	34
Philosophy	41
Science	45
Medicine	47
Public Health	50
English Scholarship, 1570–1742	53
Literature	72
Art	88
Handel and English Music	91
Agriculture, 1689–1742	99
Manufacture	110
Finance	117
The Social Economy: Pauperism	131
Social Life	137
Scotland	155
Ireland	167
Authorities, 1714–1742	169

CHAPTER XVIII.

AN ERA OF NEW DEPARTURES, 1742–1784.

Home Politics	172
England's Foreign Policy	180
The Army	189
The Navy	207
Exploration	219
Nonconformity, 1689–1815	229
Philosophy	240
Science	245
Literature	250
Art: The Great Painters	270

PAGE
AGRICULTURE 301
MANUFACTURE 305
CANALS 322
FINANCE 326
THE NATIONAL ECONOMY: PAUPERISM 336
SOCIAL LIFE 345
SCOTLAND 358
IRELAND 360
AUTHORITIES, 1742–1784 364

CHAPTER XIX.

REVOLUTION AND REACTION, 1784–1802.

POLITICAL HISTORY 366
THE ARMY 378
THE NAVY 391
EXPLORATION 401
CHURCH HISTORY FROM 1714 403
PHILOSOPHY 413
SCIENCE 415
MEDICINE 419
ART: CONTEMPORARIES AND SUCCESSORS OF REYNOLDS . . 430
LITERATURE 438
AGRICULTURE 452
MANUFACTURE 459
FINANCE 474
PRISON REFORM: HOWARD 482
SOCIAL LIFE 488
SCOTLAND 500
IRELAND 505
AUTHORITIES, 1784–1802 512

CHAPTER XX.

ENGLAND'S STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE, 1802–1815.

POLITICAL HISTORY. 515
THE ARMY 523
THE NAVY 541
THE CHURCH 544
SCIENCE 546
PHILOSOPHY 553
MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH 554
ART: INCLUDING LANDSCAPE, ENGRAVING, AND WATER-COLOUR 557
LITERATURE 578
MANUFACTURE 591
THE SOCIAL ECONOMY 604
THE STATE OF SOCIETY 613
SCOTLAND 622
AUTHORITIES, 1802–1815 625

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME.

Bateson, Miss M., Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge.

Beazley, C. Raymond, M.A., F.R.G.S., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.

Brown, Rev. John, B.A., D.D., Author of *John Bunyan: His Life, Times, and Work;* and of *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England.*

Clowes, W. Laird, Fellow of King's College, London; Hon. Member R.U.S. Inst.; Gold Medallist U.S. Naval Institute.

Colville, James, M.A., D.Sc. (Edin.), Examiner in History at Glasgow University; Editor of Spalding's *English Literature* and Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* (for Schools).

Crowest, Frederick J., Author of *The Story of British Music; The Great Tone Poets; Phases of Musical England*, etc.

Gretton, Major G. Le M., 3rd Battalion Royal Warwickshire Regiment; sometime Examiner at the University of Adelaide.

Griffiths, Major Arthur, late 63rd Regiment; H.M. Inspector of Prisons; Author of *Chronicles of Newgate; Memorials of Millbank; Secrets of the Prison House;* John Howard Gold Medallist.

Hassall, A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford, and sometime Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History; Author of *Bolingbroke* ("Statesmen" Series), and *Louis XIV.* ("Heroes of the Nations" Series); Joint Editor of and Contributor to *Constitutional Essays;* Editor of and Contributor to "Periods of European History."

Hughes, Reginald, D.C.L.

Hutton, Rev. W. H., B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford, and sometime Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History; Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at Trinity College, Cambridge; Author of *William Laud; The Marquis Wellesley; Sir Thomas More*, etc.

Joyce, P. W., LL.D., one of the Commissioners for the Publication of the Ancient Laws of Ireland; Author of *A Short History of Ireland; The Origin and History of Irish Names of Places; Old Celtic Romances: Ancient Irish Music*, etc.

Montague, F. C., M.A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and Professor of History at University College, London; Author of *The Limits of Individual Liberty: Elements of English Constitutional History.*

Power, D'Arcy, M.A., M.B. Oxon., F.R.C.S. Eng.; Surgeon to the Victoria Hospital for Children, Chelsea; Editor of *South's Memorials of the Craft of Surgery;* Author of the lives of eminent surgeons in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

PROTHERO, R. E., M.A., sometime Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford; Author of Dean Stanley's *Life;* Editor of Dean Stanley's *Letters and Verses;* Author of *Pioneers and Progress of English Farming*, etc.

SAINTSBURY, GEORGE, M.A., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh; Author of *A Short History of French Literature; Histories of Elizabethan* and *Nineteenth Century Literature; Marlborough*, etc.

SANDYS, JOHN EDWIN, Litt.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge: Hon. Litt.D. Dublin; Editor of the *Orator* of Cicero, the *Bacchae* of Euripides, the Speech of Demosthenes against Leptines, and Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens.*

SMITH, A. L., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, and sometime Examiner in the Honour School of Modern History at Oxford, and in the Historical Tripos at Cambridge.

SYMES, Professor J. E., M.A., Principal of University College, Nottingham; Author of *A Short Text-Book of Political Economy; The French Revolution; The Prelude to Modern History*, etc.

TRAILL, H. D. (Editor), sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; Author of *The Life of Sir John Franklin, Sterne, Coleridge* ("English Men of Letters" Series); *William III.* ("Twelve English Statesmen"); *The New Lucian*, etc.

WARNER, G. TOWNSEND, M.A., late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and sometime Examiner in the Historical Tripos at Cambridge.

WHITTAKER, T., B.A., Joint-Editor of Croom Robertson's *Remains;* formerly Assistant-Editor of *Mind;* Author of *Essays and Notices, Philosophical and Psychological.*

SOCIAL ENGLAND.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE AGE OF WALPOLE, 1714-1742; WITH SOME OF THE PREPARATIONS FOR IT.

THE history, whether political or social, of the eighteenth century in England cannot possibly be summed up under any one descriptive formula. Were we to restrict our survey to the first half of its course, we should certainly be disposed to pronounce it as on the whole a stationary era in our domestic history. In politics alone are there any discernible signs of advance. Here the work of the Revolution was being slowly completed and consolidated; the modern constitutional system was accumulating its precedents; and the power which a change of dynasty had thrown into the hands of one of the two great political parties was slowly dying of its own abuses. Events were leading, step by step, to the overthrow of that oligarchy which the Whigs had built up on the site, and largely with the materials, of the demolished edifice of Stuart rule; and the ground was being steadily prepared for that re-erection of the constitutional fabric on a broader and more popular basis which, but for the panic engendered by the French earthquake—a phenomenon always discouraging to builders—would probably have been accomplished before the century closed.

But in most other departments of the national life we shall find, in the earlier part of the century, few signs of active growth. The philosophic thought of the age was mainly critical and destructive; religious sentiment throughout the first half of the century was dormant or declining; art during the same period has no triumphs to record; and

though prose literature indeed throve vigorously, the poetic spirit waned almost to the point of extinction. We have to wait till the century has run more than half its course before trade and agriculture take their forward stride: and it was only after it had entered on its last decade that the age underwent that mighty change from comparative inertia into vehement, and in many respects alarming, activity which gives it a unique place in our history.

GEORGE I. arrived in England on September 10th, 1714, and, though not received with much applause, he was supported by all lovers of order and by all the adherents of the Established Church. His accession was a Whig triumph.

A. HASSALL. Political History.

George, who was a prudent, unostentatious man, had no knowledge of the English constitution, and evinced no intention of endangering his position by trying experiments with a mixed ministry. The extreme Tories had undoubtedly hoped and prepared for a Stuart restoration, and George very naturally placed himself unreservedly in the hands of the Whigs. Townshend (p. 108), who had made the Barrier Treaty, became Prime Minister, and the other leading members of the Government were Stanhope, Sunderland, Cowper, Nottingham, Pulteney, Marlborough and Walpole. Of these Townshend, Stanhope, and Walpole carried the greatest weight. In the election which occurred six months after Anne's death, the influence of the Government secured the return of a large Whig majority, and from 1715 to the accession of George III. the ascendancy of the Whigs continued without any intermission. During this long period of Whig rule the main principles of government became fixed, and the effects of the Revolution of 1688 were fully worked out. Owing to the interest taken by George I. and George II. in Hanoverian politics and their own ignorance of English customs and usages, the chief direction of affairs fell into the hands of the ministers, Cabinet government was in great measure established, and our Parliamentary system gradually assumed the features which now distinguish it.

George I.'s First Cabinet.

Constitutional Development.

Townshend's ministry, which lasted from 1714 to 1717,

was mainly occupied in securing the peaceful accession of the new dynasty and defending it from disaffection in England and from a Jacobite rebellion in Scotland. Riots which had broken out at the close of 1714 showed plainly that the country was Tory, though not Jacobite, at heart—*i.e.* though the majority of Englishmen were strongly in favour of hereditary right, their devotion to the Established Church prevented them from supporting the Pretender so long as he remained a Roman Catholic. Their attitude, therefore, to the new king was one of sullen hostility. George was disliked as a foreigner, but since the Pretender refused to recant, the Government had no cause to fear the active opposition of any large section of Englishmen.

Townshend's Ministry, 1714–1717.

By the elections held at the beginning of 1715 the Whigs secured a large majority, and at once took measures against their opponents. Bolingbroke fled to France and entered into the service of the Pretender; Ormond followed his example, and both fugitives were attainted; Oxford was impeached, remained without trial in the Tower for two years, and then was acquitted. These severe measures tended still further to alienate the Tory party, to increase the hopes of the Jacobites, and to bring about the outbreak of the Rebellion of 1715. On September 6th, 1715, James Edward's standard was raised at Kirkmichael, in October Mackintosh joined Foster and Kenmare, and on November 12th the Jacobites were defeated at Preston, and all danger of an insurrection in England was over. The indecisive battle of Sheriffmuir (p. 11) was fought on November 13th, and was followed by the rapid dispersion of the Highlanders. At the end of December James Edward landed in Scotland only to find that the rising had failed, and on February 4th, 1716, he re-embarked for France. Want of good management, the lack of help from France, the non-appearance of the Pretender at the opening of the struggle, and the failure of the English Jacobites to effect a general and simultaneous rising in Scotland were the principal causes of the collapse of the Jacobite rebellion. Many Jacobites were executed, Bolingbroke was dismissed from the Pretender's service, and the Regent Orleans and Dubois inclined towards an alliance with George I. The Whigs had

The Jacobite Rising.

secured a signal triumph. The influence of the Church had received a severe blow: it remained for the Government to strengthen its position and that of the Hanoverian dynasty. In 1716 the Septennial Act was passed, due to the conviction that elections held at that juncture would cause disorders and tumults, even if they did not result in the overthrow of the Government. In spite of the drawbacks attending a measure which tended to increase corruption at elections and in the House of Commons, and to bring the country gentlemen for a longer period to London, the Septennial Act undoubtedly contributed to secure the stability of the Hanoverian dynasty, to lessen the number of elections, to increase the power of the House of Commons, and to ensure the continuity of England's foreign policy. There is no doubt that the circumstances of the time justified the passing of the Act.

The Septennial Act, 1716.

In 1717 occurred the famous Whig Schism—the beginning of those divisions which eventually enabled George III. to assert his own personal authority and to place the Tories in power. In 1716 George I. went to Hanover with Stanhope, and in his absence Townshend supported the Prince of Wales in a quarrel with his father, and made himself very unpopular with the king's Hanoverian favourites in England. He also strongly disapproved of the suspicious attitude taken by George and his Hanoverian ministers towards England's ally, Peter the Great, who was helping us against Charles XII. of Sweden. Personal dislike on the part of the king for Townshend and Walpole, coupled with the intrigues of Charles, Earl of Sunderland against his colleagues, helped to bring matters to a crisis. On December 15th, 1716, Townshend was dismissed, and on April 10th, after a sharp debate on a motion to grant George money for the Swedish war, Walpole and Pulteney resigned, and a few days later Oxford and Devonshire followed their example. Stanhope became First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sunderland and Addison Secretaries of State. The New Ministry closed Convocation and so dealt a severe blow at the independence of the Established Church. It alleviated the position of the Dissenters by its repeal of the Schism Act, which restricted their

The Whig Split, 1717.

Stanhope's Ministry, 1717-1721.

educational facilities, and the Occasional Conformity Act, which interfered with their holding municipal and other offices—both products of the Jacobite Toryism of Anne's reign (IV., p. 513). But it failed to carry the Peerage Bill, restricting the right of the Crown to create Peers.* In 1720 Walpole and Townshend again joined the Government, which was shortly afterwards overthrown, Stanhope, Craggs, and other ministers being involved in the "South Sea Bubble" (p. 127). Stanhope's fall established the ascendancy of Walpole and Townshend, and the former remained Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the ruling spirit in the Cabinet from 1721 to 1742, with the exception of the six weeks following the death of George I. During his ministry the Cabinet system was considerably developed, though it was not till the time of the younger Pitt that it was secure from the interference of the sovereign.

Walpole's Rule 1721-1742.

Walpole's long tenure of office was due to a variety of causes. He was supported by the moneyed classes and by the Dissenters, who were promised the repeal of the Test and the Corporations Acts. He gained, moreover, a firm ascendancy over both his Royal masters. His peace policy was, during most of his career, advantageous to English interests, and secured for the country that immense material development which was the principal cause of our successes in the great wars of the century. The expulsion of Bolingbroke from the House of Lords, the long absence of Carteret in Ireland, and the death of Sunderland relieved him from much serious opposition in the early years of his ministry, while his unvarying respect for the wishes of the people in all matters except that of Parliamentary corruption rendered his position undeniably strong. His influence in the House of Commons was immense, and to him that House owes its great importance in the reigns of the first two Georges. Bribery was reduced to an organised system; and that, combined with his singular skill in management, his good humour, tact, and frankness, rendered the sway of the great Commoner irresistibly powerful (p. 119).

He was equally opposed to the Jacobites and the Roman

* Had this passed, the rule of the Whig Oligarchy would have been rendered perpetual, and no constitutional means would have existed for overcoming the opposition of the Lords to the wishes of the Crown or the Commons.

Catholics, and to the entry of England into any European war ; he was very sensitive to opposition on the part of his colleagues, he had a great dislike of change or innovation, his influence on the Church was baneful, he was ignorant if not contemptuous of literature.

The Opposition.

Gradually a powerful opposition grew up which at the end of 1726 began a series of fierce attacks on the home and foreign policy of the ministry. This opposition consisted of the Hanoverian Tories under Wyndham, the discontented Whigs under Pulteney, and the Jacobites under Shippen and Barnard. In the reign of George II. this opposition was strengthened by the support of a number of "Boy Patriots," as they were called, including Pitt and Chesterfield. The work of Bolingbroke and Pulteney was to organise all these various elements into a compact opposition. For this the *Craftsman* was started, and for many years attacked Walpole's ministry with extraordinary violence.

The Reign of George II, 1727–1760.

In 1727 the death of George I. was followed by a brief period during which Sir Spencer Compton ousted Walpole from office. The latter was soon found to be indispensable, and after a short interval he returned to power, supported by George II., and more especially by the queen. In 1730 Townshend retired from the ministry, having differed with Walpole on questions of foreign policy, and having realised that his influence with George II. was less than that of his brother-in-law. The ascendancy of Walpole was now absolute and uncontrolled, and was confirmed by the hopeless condition of the Jacobites, by the continuance of peace, and by the growing prosperity at home.

The Excise Bill.

In 1733 he attempted to introduce his one measure of importance, Excise Bill (p. 121 *seqq.*). Upon its withdrawal, Chesterfield, who had voted against it, was dismissed from his office of Lord Steward of the Household, and with him several other holders of Government posts. Walpole's majority seemed as strong as ever, and Bolingbroke, despairing of success, retired in 1734 to the Continent.

The death of the queen, on November 20th, 1737, was a serious blow to Walpole, and the Opposition fondly hoped that his overthrow would take place. But the king's support of

his minister was not withdrawn. In October, 1739, in deference to public opinion (p. 13), Walpole declared war against Spain, but it was not till 1741 that his difficulties began to prove too much for him. The failure of the English operations against Spain, and the general dissatisfaction at the foreign policy of the minister, led to his fall, and on February 3rd, 1742, Walpole resigned.

Walpole's Work.

By a policy of peace and conciliation, by careful administrations and sound finance, by Parliamentary management and bribery, and by securing the support of the Queen Caroline, Walpole succeeded in firmly establishing the Hanoverian dynasty on the throne and in promoting the national prosperity. His fall, while it brought no change in the domestic policy of the Government, was followed by a new departure in foreign policy. "The fall of Walpole," says von Ranke, "was not the fall of an ordinary minister, but the fall of the political system based upon the first union of the House of Hanover with the Regent of France."

England and Europe.

The foreign policy of George I.'s Government was successful in so far as the maintenance of peace was concerned; but it was marked by two serious defects. The Whig Ministers, by allowing the encroachments of the Emperor in Italy, showed no appreciation of the existence of national feeling in that country, while their northern policy was affected by the Hanoverian predilections of George I. In their desire for peace the ministers were consulting the true interests of the country. England had but lately emerged from a severe war, and required rest and freedom from foreign complications. The position of George I. remained precarious even after the suppression of the Rebellion of 1715, and it was well known that the Pretender and his supporters only awaited an opportunity to make another attempt to upset the Hanoverian Government. On the Continent things were still in a very disturbed state; Austria and Spain had not made peace, and the Emperor still claimed the throne of Spain; while in the North of Europe a league of the powers of the Baltic had been formed against Charles XII. of Sweden. Confronted by all these difficulties, it behoved Stanhope to

walk warily. Anxious to prevent the Pretender from gaining assistance from France, and alarmed at the aggressive attitude of Peter the Great in Mecklenburg,* George I. willingly accepted the overtures of the French Minister Dubois, whom he met at The Hague, and again in Hanover. The Regent Orleans, who governed France on behalf of his nephew, the young Louis XV., feared an attempt on the part of Philip V., King of Spain, to secure the Regency for himself, and was anxious to obtain an English alliance. In December, 1716, the two countries made a treaty which, with the adhesion of Holland on January 4th, 1717, became known as the Triple Alliance. This Triple Alliance was at once recognised as a very important event for Europe. For over twenty years England and France, lately enemies, remained allies, and prevented the outbreak of any considerable war till 1733. The Triple Alliance was a great blow to the Jacobites, and the Pretender was forced to take refuge in Lorraine. France, after the late exhausting war, was enabled to enjoy a period of much-needed rest, to decline the proffered Russian alliance, and to reduce her expenditure.

The Triple Alliance, 1717.

For a time, however, this new friendship between England and France seemed only to increase the difficulties of the situation. Both the Emperor and Philip of Spain were furious at the treaty. With England Spain, under her capable minister Alberoni, had concluded a commercial treaty at the end of 1715, followed by the final settlement of the Assiento Treaty in 1716 (p. 13). With Austria England had concluded the Treaty of Westminster in May, 1716. Both Spain and Austria now felt outwitted, each having hoped that England would aid them against the other, and the next question which Stanhope found himself compelled to settle was concerned with the rival claims of these two Powers. By the Treaty of Utrecht Naples and Sardinia had been given to Austria and Sicily to the Duke of Savoy, with the title of king, the reversion of the island being settled upon the Spanish rulers in the event of the line of Savoy becoming extinct. The Emperor was determined to exchange Sardinia for Sicily; and

* While supporting his nephew, the Duke of Mecklenburg, Peter seemed to aim at the establishment of Russian influence in the Duchy.

when the Spaniards, being aware of his purpose, occupied Sardinia in 1717 and Sicily in 1718, they were only acting in defence of their undoubted rights. Stanhope, however, was resolved at all hazards to preserve peace in the South of Europe. He and Orleans determined to support the Emperor's pretensions to Sicily, and an English fleet, under Admiral Byng, defeated the Spanish fleet off Cape Passaro, on August 11th, 1718, and at one blow overthrew all the plans of Philip V. and Alberoni. Austria joined the Triple Alliance, which now became known as the Quadruple Alliance, and was allowed to exchange Sardinia for Sicily; Spanish dockyards and ships were attacked by the English fleet, while Spain was invaded in the spring of 1719 by a French army; and at the end of the year Alberoni, on the urgent representations of Stanhope, was dismissed. Early in 1720 Philip V. agreed to the terms of the Quadruple Alliance, by which Don Carlos, the eldest son of his second wife, Elizabeth Farnese, was promised the eventual succession to the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany.

It becomes Quadruple, 1718.

Though Stanhope's policy had been shortsighted and high-handed; though he had alienated Spain, from whom he might have gained valuable commercial concessions; though he had ignored the aspirations of the Italians to be freed from the German yoke, and though he had not considered the interests of English trade in the Mediterranean, he could at any rate point to the fact that, by the Quadruple Alliance, he had pacified the South of Europe.

The failure of Alberoni's attempt to check the German encroachments in Italy enabled Stanhope to turn his attention to the Baltic, where the northern war was raging. Denmark, unable to keep Bremen and Verden, which she had seized from Sweden, had handed them over to George, who wished to annex them to his electorate. The Emperor's ratification of the cession was necessary, and this had been to some extent secured by the Treaty of Westminster in 1716.

Northern Europe.

In order to aid George to extend his electorate, and to protect it during the northern war, Stanhope had disregarded the Treaty of Utrecht and ignored the interests of Italy. But the influence of the Hanoverian advisers of George I.

brought about a coolness between England and Russia. The dubious conduct of the Tsar with regard to Mecklenburg had raised general suspicion, which, carefully fostered by Alberoni, would have led to an alliance between Peter the Great and Charles XII. had not the latter been killed at the close of the year 1718. The simultaneous overthrow of two such men as Alberoni and Charles XII. produced a feeling of relief in both England and France. Sweden at once renounced her policy of alliance with Russia, and, guided by Carteret's advice, made treaties with Hanover, England, Prussia, Poland, and Denmark.

Though England failed in her endeavour to aid Sweden in the war which broke out between her and Russia, French mediation brought about the Peace of Nystad between the two countries in 1721, and Stanhope and Dubois had the satisfaction of seeing their policy of peace successfully carried out; England, in alliance with France and Germany, had no cause to fear a Jacobite invasion, and George I. was secure on the English throne.

Walpole's Foreign Policy.

Walpole's policy was one of peace and a French alliance, but until the retirement of Townshend in 1729 he was not personally responsible for the foreign policy of the ministry. During the years from 1721 to 1729 Europe was in constant turmoil owing to the schemes of Elizabeth Farnese to secure Italian duchies for her sons, while the English ministry was hampered in its relations with Spain on account of a promise made by George I. in 1721 to restore Gibraltar, and in its relations with Austria by the determination of Charles VI. to support his Ostend East India Company. The unnatural alliance arranged between Spain and Austria in 1725 by the Treaty of Vienna was followed by the counter Treaty of Hanover, the work of Townshend and Bourbon, and of which Walpole strongly disapproved. War actually broke out with Spain in 1727, but beyond the disastrous blockade by Admiral Hosier of Porto Bello and a short siege of Gibraltar by Spain (p. 12), no serious hostilities occurred. The Treaty of Seville, 1729, followed by the Treaty of Vienna in 1731, were signal proofs of Walpole's pacific policy, though he could not avoid giving Charles VI. a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, which secured the succession to his dominions.

In 1733 the War of the Polish Succession began, and Holland's refusal to take any part in the struggle strengthened Walpole in his fixed resolve to remain faithful to the French Alliance. The Austrian Court bitterly reproached England for her neutrality and desertion of an old ally, and Carteret, whose knowledge of foreign affairs was profound, supported the view that England's interests demanded that the power of the Bourbons should be checked. But Walpole feared a Jacobite invasion, backed by French gold and arms, and perhaps by French regiments, and England remained at peace till 1739. In that year the Opposition succeeded in forcing Walpole into war with Spain. For many years commercial and colonial disputes between England and Spain had been of frequent occurrence, and the episode of Jenkins' ear (p. 13) had aroused public feeling. Most reluctantly Walpole declared war, and in 1741 found that England was likely to be involved in a still wider struggle caused by the attack on Maria Theresa by France, Prussia, Spain, Sardinia, Saxony, and Bavaria. His management of the war against Spain was inefficient, and when he resigned, at the beginning of 1742, it was evident that his system of a French alliance had come to an end, and that England was on the verge of a great struggle to preserve the balance of power on the sea against the Bourbons.

The War with Spain, 1739.

THERE is probably no period of modern English history more lacking in military interest than the twenty-eight years with which this chapter deals. In Britain there was the abortive Jacobite rising known as "The '15," when one wing of the Scottish rebels marched as far as Preston in Lancashire before they were dispersed; while the other, under the Earl of Mar, attacked King George's troops at Sheriffmuir, near Stirling. As at Killicrankie, where in 1689 the rush of the Highlanders had swept the English infantry before them, so at Sheriffmuir it was proved that many of our professional troops were not yet steady enough to withstand a charge of wild Celtic mountaineers. Where the clans were opposed by red-coated foot-soldiers only, they carried all before them; but a counter attack of cavalry

G. LE M. GRETTON. The Army. The '15.

routed part of their line, and converted the Hanoverian defeat into a drawn battle.

Siege of Gibraltar.

In the Mediterranean, the naval war with Spain kept the garrisons of Minorca and Gibraltar on the alert. In 1720 our spies discovered that the Spaniards were preparing for a *coup de main* against the Rock. The garrison had been reduced to three weak battalions, with provisions for fourteen days only; but reinforcements from Minorca were hastily thrown in, and for the time the danger was averted. In 1727 the storm burst, and the fortress underwent a siege, the memory of which has been eclipsed by the glories of the Great Siege of half a century later. Yet in 1727 the attack, though by land only, was vigorous; and at first the position of the British was an anxious one. Against the investing force of 19,000 Spaniards, we could muster but 1,500 men. To reply to the 164 guns and mortars, from which 700 projectiles could be hurled hourly against our batteries, there were only 58 guns in position, many of which were of very light calibre. Within the walls treason was at work. Then, as now, Jews and Moors swarmed on the Rock, eager for gain, however acquired. Some of these worthies agreed with the Spaniards to seize the gates and throw them open at a given time. The conspiracy was detected; the culprits were executed and flayed, and their skins were nailed to the gates of the fortress as a grim object-lesson on the disadvantages of unsuccessful treachery. Our command of the sea soon enabled Government to land large reinforcements of men and of warlike stores. The garrison was increased to 7,000 men; more guns were mounted; the artillery duel became more equal. Gradually our fire completely overpowered that of the Spaniards; we destroyed 96 of their guns and mortars, and so demoralised their gunners that the bombardment ceased. After five months the siege was raised, and peace was made between the two countries—a peace destined to be soon broken by our disastrous expedition against Carthagena and the Spanish Main.

The War of Jenkins' Ear.

The traditional policy of Spain has been to close her colonial ports against foreign merchants and foreign goods; and against this policy the commercial instincts of England have ever chafed. By the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), in addition to

various accessions of territory to the Crown (such as Nova Scotia, Gibraltar, Hudson's Bay, and the islands of Newfoundland, Minorca, and St. Kitts), an important privilege was obtained for British traders. By the Assiento Treaty (1716: p. 8) Spain granted to an English company the temporary monopoly of the slave trade with the Spanish colonies, and thus gave Englishmen a footing in these countries. Three years later England further acquired the right to send one trading-ship of 600 tons annually to Panama. Our traders were active, pushing, unscrupulous, and determined to take an ell for every inch wrung from the reluctant Spaniards. An immense amount of smuggling was carried on under our flag; and when the annual ship sailed with her freight, other vessels followed in her wake, and secretly refilled her at night as she lay in the Spanish port. Thus the cargo of the one ship became almost inexhaustible. The Spanish Custom House officials were brutal and oppressive; they maltreated our sailors, and searched our ships on the high seas. Each nation had undoubted grievances against the other: each was haughty and unconciliatory; each became eager for revenge. Walpole struggled, but in vain, against the war party. The patriots, as the latter styled themselves, brought a sea captain named Jenkins to the bar of the House of Commons, to describe the outrages to which he professed to have been subjected by the commander of a Spanish revenue ship. This official boarded Jenkins' vessel and charged him with smuggling; but, finding nothing contraband on board, revenged himself by tearing off Jenkins' ear. When asked what his feelings had been, Jenkins electrified all England by replying: "I commended my soul to God, and my cause to my country."

Whether Jenkins' story was true or not, it roused the English to frenzy, and Walpole, against his convictions but to save his place, declared war against Spain. Our first blow was directed against Porto Bello, then an important trading centre on the Atlantic side of the Isthmus of Panama, not far from the site of the modern city of Aspinwall. Vernon, a hitherto unknown admiral, with six men-of-war and a handful of soldiers demolished its fortifications. This exploit turned the nation's head. Nothing less was demanded than the total destruction of the Spanish settlements in the New World. Anson was sent

with a squadron to ravage the coasts of Chili and Peru. To Vernon, who had become the popular idol, was entrusted the naval command of the expedition which in 1740 was despatched against the Spanish possessions in the Gulf of Mexico. Including the transports, which carried 10,000 troops, Vernon was responsible for no less than 115 vessels, manned by 15,000 seamen. With so noble an armament success appeared assured; but the deep-rooted jealousy which existed between the two branches of the service ruined the expedition. As long as Lord Cathcart was commander of the troops all went well. His good sense and tact are displayed in his celebrated letter to Vernon. "In the troops I bring you there is spirit, there is good will; which, when properly conducted, will produce, I hope, what the nation expects from us—will make us the glorious instruments of finishing the war, with all the advantages to the public that its happy beginning promises; and with this distinguishing circumstance, that those happy effects have been owing to a perfect harmony between the sea and the land forces." Cathcart unfortunately died before active operations commenced; and the command of the troops devolved upon General Wentworth, who had nothing in common with Vernon but his obstinacy, and who possessed as great a contempt for the Navy as the admiral had for the sister service.

Our Failure at Carthagena.

It was determined to attack Carthagena, then an important and strongly-fortified town on the Caribbean Sea, on the west coast of the country which is now known as the United States of Colombia. With incredible stupidity Vernon divulged to a French acquaintance the object of the expedition. The Frenchman instantly warned the Spaniards, who thus had time to increase the garrison to 4,000 men, to mount 300 guns, and to make all the necessary preparations for defence. Yet when, in March, 1741, the British fleet appeared off Carthagena, at first it carried all before it; and the fortifications of the outer harbour were breached and stormed. After this one success, however, nothing went well. Vernon and Wentworth quarrelled. The admiral sneered at the soldiers for not instantly taking the main fortress by storm, and continually railed against what he termed "their laziness." The general complained of the sailors' refusal to land

his tents, stores, and artillery, and persistently inquired why Vernon's warships did not bombard the town. At length, after great delay, an attempt was made to breach the walls of the most important Spanish work—the fort of St. Lazarus; but before the breach was practicable, Vernon goaded Wentworth into making an attack in which everything was mismanaged. It was intended that the assault should be delivered by night, but sunrise found the storming column, 1,200 strong, impatiently awaiting the signal to advance. When the welcome order was at length received, the men sprang joyfully forward; but the Spanish deserters who were their guides led them against the strongest face of the fort, not against the weakest, as had been arranged. The scaling-ladders proved to be too short; the hand grenades had been forgotten. The main body of the troops made no feigned attacks to distract the enemy's attention. The Navy remained inactive; hardly a shot was fired into the town by Vernon's twenty-seven line-of-battle ships, his bomb-ketches, or his numerous frigates. The assaulting column, exposed in front and in flank to a withering fire, unable to reach their enemy, unsupported by their comrades or by the fleet, sullenly retired. They left 600 men—half their original number—dead or wounded on the *glacis* of Fort Lazarus, victims to the jealousy and incapacity of their unworthy chiefs. This one reverse and the unhealthiness of the climate induced Vernon and Wentworth to re-embark the troops and sail for Jamaica. After various abortive demonstrations against other Spanish colonies, the expedition straggled back to England. They left behind them the bones of about 15,000 men, of whom the vast majority had succumbed to the effects of the climate and to the neglect of all medical and sanitary precautions which disgraced this miserable campaign. The American colonies, as well as the mother country, had bitter cause to remember the Carthagena expedition, for among the troops engaged were four battalions of New England Volunteers, of whom scarcely one man in fifty returned to his native province.

While our arms were being thus disgraced in the West Indies, George II. plunged the country into the war of the Austrian Succession. To assist the cause of Maria Theresa our army was increased to 62,000 men; and a corps of 16,000

British troops was despatched to the Continent, once more to face the French upon the blood-stained plains of Flanders. To the next chapter belongs the account of this war; but it will be convenient here to anticipate, and to touch on the condition of the Army, as described by General Wolfe in his letters to his father. James Wolfe joined in 1742; he served with distinction in the Low Countries and in Scotland; in 1755 he was one of the men marked for speedy promotion. Yet in that year he thus writes to his father, an old officer of high standing:—

The State of the Army.

"I have but a very mean opinion of the infantry in general. I know their discipline to be bad, and their valour precarious. They are easy to be put into disorder and hard to recover out of it. They frequently kill their officers through fear, and murder each other in the confusion. . . . . I am sorry to say that our method of training and instructing the troops is extremely defective and tends to no good end. We are lazy in time of peace, and of course want vigilance and activity in time of war. Our military education is by far the worst in Europe, and all our concerns are treated with contempt or wholly neglected."

The condition of Portsmouth (p. 217), then, as now, one of our chief garrison towns, he thus describes:—

"There is not the least shadow of discipline, care or attention. Disorderly soldiers . . . . are collected here; some from the ships, others from the hospital, others waiting to embark—dirty, drunken, insolent scoundrels improved by the hellish nature of the place, where every kind of corruption, immorality, and looseness is carried to excess."

Many of the rank and file required no "improving" in Portsmouth; they were already the lowest of the low. Recruiting for the army was managed in the time of the Georges in the same way as it had been in the reign of Queen Anne. Tramps, loafers, and gaol-birds were pressed into the ranks, and forced to serve for life, or as long as the king required them; and bounties were given to men who enlisted voluntarily. During the Seven Years' War the supply of recruits ran so short that the bounty offered by Government ceased to attract them. Several large towns opened subscription lists to raise a fund with which to supplement the efforts of the recruiting-sergeants; and in London alone, £7,039 was collected, which procured 1,235 recruits at the price of £5 5s. per head.

Towards his brother officers Wolfe is hardly more complimentary than towards the men. In another letter he says

that if he stays much longer with his regiment he will become "perfectly corrupt, for the officers are loose and profligate and the soldiers are very devils." Much must be forgiven to men who led the lives of unutterable dulness which Wolfe describes in country quarters. When commanding his battalion at Dover Castle, he found the afternoons hang so heavy that "expedients were wanting to divert the time."

"Our conversation from dinner till 5 o'clock is kept up with some difficulty, as none of us have any correspondence with the capital, nor communication with coffee-houses or public papers, so that we are entirely in the dark as to exterior things. From 5 to 8 is a tedious interval hardly to be worked through."

If garrison life was monotonous, officers on leave occasionally took refuge in strong excitements. A captain mortally wounded a publican who ventured to present a bill for wine consumed in a tavern. Two subalterns, travelling post, became annoyed with the post-boy for walking his horses up a hill and ran him through the body.

In a service where such slackness and demoralisation existed, it is not surprising that the drill was bad. The future hero of Quebec complains that no instructions for the training of a battalion had ever been issued in his time, nor any general principles laid down by which officers could be guided. "Hence the variety of steps in our infantry and the disorderly floating of our lines." The art of marksmanship seems to have been generally ignored, for Wolfe, in a letter to a friend, earnestly begs him to teach his troops to fire with ball.

Drill.

"Let me recommend the practice, you will soon find the advantage of it. . . . . It may not have been thought of by your commander, and I have experience of its great utility."

Wolfe's course of musketry was admirable; as he details it to his friend it reads like a page out of a modern circular from Hythe.

"Firing balls at objects teaches the soldiers to level incomparably, makes the recruit steady, and removes the foolish apprehension that seizes young soldiers when they first load their arms with bullets. We fire first singly, then by files, one, two, three, or more, and lastly by platoons; and the soldiers see the effect of their shots—especially at a mark or upon

water. We shoot obliquely and on different situations of ground, from heights downwards or contrariwise." *

Tactics.

During the first half of the eighteenth century there were no marked improvements in tactics. Cavalry had degenerated into unwieldy masses of horsemen who, unable to move at speed, charged at a slow trot, and fought only with pistol and carbine; while infantry attacked in heavy columns, and did little execution with their muskets, which they preferred to use as pikes. Then a great military reformer arose and astonished Europe. Frederick the Great reorganised his cavalry; he taught them to manœuvre at full speed, to charge at the gallop, and, discarding the use of firearms, to rely for victory on shock action and the cold steel. His infantry were so perfectly drilled and disciplined that he could trust them to attack in line; and he relied as much on his musketry-fire as on the bayonet for his success in battle. By dint of incessant practice he trained his foot-soldiers to load and fire far more rapidly than any other troops in Europe. It is stated on good authority that they could on an emergency fire five steady volleys in one minute. In artillery Frederick also made improvements, for he realised that to thoroughly develop its value on the battle-field guns should be able to change their position rapidly, as the varying phases of the combat require. He therefore formed light batteries, so powerfully horsed that they were able to keep up with cavalry moving at full speed. Frederick's daring innovation in abandoning the column and adopting the line as the formation for attack at first filled Europe with amazement, then, as its success became apparent, with admiration. Though by no means adapted to the soldiery of every nation, this formation suited the genius of the English so well that it has become part of the national system of tactics. It appears to have been employed for the first time in our army at the battle of Minden in 1759, where our contingent of infantry, advancing in lines across a plain swept by the fire of many batteries, triumphantly met the charge of more than sixty French squadrons, whom, by our steady and extended fire, we defeated and partially destroyed.

* These extracts from Wolfe's letters are taken from Wright's valuable "Life of Wolfe."

On the deaths of William III. in 1702, of Anne in 1714, of George I. in 1727, and of George II. in 1760 respectively, the material strength of the Royal Navy, so far as rated ships were concerned, was as follows:—

W. LAIRD CLOWES. The Navy.

	1702.		1714.		1727.		1760.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
First rates ...	7	10,955	7	11,703	7	12,945	5	9,958
Second rates...	14	19,447	13	19,323	13	20,125	13	22,825
Third rates ...	47	51,988	42	47,768	40	47,958	74	109,494
Fourth rates .	62	42,940	69	51,379	64	50,754	63	67,901
Fifth rates ...	30	11,469	42	19,836	27	15,065	54	39,173
Sixth rates ...	15	3,611	24	6,435	27	9,760	61	31,618
	175	140,410	197	156,444	178	156,607	270	280,969

First-rates, it may be explained, were vessels of 100 guns or upwards on three complete decks; second-rates, of from 90 to 100 guns on three decks; third-rates, of from 64 to 84 guns on two complete decks; fourth-rates, of from 50 to 60 guns on two decks; fifth-rates, of from 30 to 44 guns; and sixth-rates, of from 20 to 30 guns. These were captains' commands. Smaller vessels, classed as sloops, were commanded by commanders, and still smaller ones, such as gun-brigs and bombs, by lieutenants. But the system of rating men-of-war had been, until the reign of Anne, somewhat irregular. Rating was introduced, it is true, in the middle of the seventeenth century. Up to the end of that century, however, we find 64's and 70's classed as second-rates, 60's as third-rates, and 30's and 32's as fourth-rates. Progress in matter of size was more conspicuous after the commencement of the eighteenth century than it had been up to the end of the reign of William, when there was no vessel of more than 1,700 tons burthen in the Navy. Before the death of George II., a first-rate (the *Royal George*), of 2,047 tons; a second-rate (the *Sandwich*), of 1,869 tons; a third-rate (the *Valiant*), of 1,799 tons; and a fourth-rate (the *Chatham*), of 1,052 tons, had been built. Thus, in the course of about fifty years, the new fourth-rates had grown to be as large as the old third-rates, and the new third-rates to be even larger than the old first-rates. And the weight of armament of most of the rates had increased proportionately. For example, a 90-gun second-rate of 1716 threw 1,606 lbs. of

The Material of the Navy.

metal, but a 90-gun second-rate of 1745 threw 1,684 lbs.; a 70-gun third-rate of 1716 threw 1,056 lbs., but a 70-gun third-rate of 1745 threw 1,480 lbs.; and a 50-gun fourth-rate of 1716 threw 642 lbs., but a 50-gun fourth-rate of 1745 threw 840 lbs. Similarly, the strength and weight of all gear increased. The weight of bower anchors was, for instance: for a first-rate in 1706, 74 cwts., in 1747, 81 cwts.; for a second-rate in 1706, 66½ cwts., in 1747, 73½ cwts.; for a third-rate in 1706, 49 cwts., in 1747, 58¾ cwts.; and for a fourth-rate in 1706, 36½ cwts., in 1747, 49 cwts. Attention has already been directed (IV., p. 50) to the manner in which the timber of the *Sovereign of the Seas*, of 1637, had been seasoned. In 1684 it had been found that all the ancient wood then in the ship was so hard that "it was no easy matter to drive a nail into it." Another method was tried, early in the eighteenth century, with the *Royal William*, a small first-rate, which, launched in 1719, remained in commission, latterly as an 84, until long after the beginning of the present century, though she was not in her old age sent to sea. The thick stuff and plank were burnt, instead of being merely kilned, as had been usual; and the ends of the beams, the faying parts of the breast-hooks, crutches, riders, knees, etc., were gouged, or "snail-creeped," in order to admit of the circulation of air in parts where otherwise there would have been none. Later, Mr. Barnard, a progressive builder of Harwich, who in 1757 launched the *Achilles*, 60, put into her, unknown to the Navy Board, winter-felled timber, which he had barked in the previous spring. In 1770 the timbers of the frame were observed to be unusually sound; and the ship was by no means in bad condition when she was sold in 1784, though she had previously been much neglected.

Naval Promotion.

At this period, and until nearly the middle of the eighteenth century, the flag-list was of very modest proportions, and betrayed no tendency to swell to the enormous size which it assumed later. The list consisted merely of an admiral of the fleet—or, as he was then called, an admiral and commander-in-chief—an admiral of the white squadron, an admiral of the blue, a vice-admiral of the red, one of the white, and one of the blue, and a rear-admiral of the red, one of the white, and one of the blue, or nine flag-officers in all, with sometimes three more holding the offices

of admiral, vice-admiral, and rear-admiral of Great Britain. The rank of superannuated, or retired, rear-admiral was not established until 1747; so that at most there were but twelve flag-officers at any given moment. Promotion from post-rank was, consequently, increasingly slow, for, though there were so few admirals, there were always, necessarily, many captains. Sir John Leak, made a rear-admiral in 1703, had been a captain only fourteen years; Sir Edward Whitaker, made in 1705, was of fifteen years' standing; Sir John Norris, in 1707, was of seventeen years'; Sir Hovenden Walker, in 1710, was of eighteen years'; James Littleton, in 1716, was of twenty-three years'; Francis Hosier, in 1720, was of twenty-four years'; Sir George Walton, in 1723, was of twenty-six years'; Salmon Morrice, in 1727, was of thirty years'; Sir Chaloner Ogle, in 1739, was of thirty-one years'; Richard Lestock, in 1742, was of thirty-six years'; and thus the age of flag-officers mounted steadily until, in order to have admirals who were still fit for employment, the Admiralty was driven not only to enlarge the list but also to formulate a scheme of retirement for very old captains. The enlargement of the list began in 1742; the scheme of retirement came into force, as has been said, in 1747, when the first captain who took advantage of it was of nearly forty years' standing.

"Admiral of the Red."

It will have been noticed that the rank, so called, of admiral of the red, did not exist. The position was filled by the admiral of the fleet, who, however, flew not a red flag but the union at his main-truck. There was, nevertheless, a popular superstition, which was even shared in high quarters, to the effect that the rank of admiral of the red had existed at some previous time, and had been abolished, owing to an admiral of the red having been taken by the enemy. There was no ground for this superstition; yet it was so firmly rooted all through the eighteenth century, that when early in the nineteenth century admirals of the red were first established, the event was officially chronicled as a "restoration" of the rank to the Navy. Sir George Ayscue, who was taken by the Dutch in 1666, and with whom the fable appears to have been generally associated, was admiral not of the red but of the white squadron.

The conditions under which voyages were made greatly

improved. Hadley's quadrant, an account of which was first made public in 1731, soon afterwards came into general use; marine surveying made notable strides; and lighting and buoying were much extended. "The Whole Art of Navigation," by Captain Daniel Newhouse (1727), and "The Mariner's New Kalendar," by Nathaniel Colson (1746), and the earliest of Harrison's time-keepers (1726-58), prepared the way for a new era of navigation. The Nore (1731) and the Dudgeon (1736) lightships were the first vessels of their kind to be moored off the English coasts; and the light on the far-off and dangerous Skerries dates from 1730.

Naval Voyages.

The voyages and discoveries prosecuted by naval officers in men-of-war were of some importance. At the head of all ranks the voyage of Commodore George (afterwards Lord) Anson, who, on September 18th, 1740, sailed from England for the South Seas with the *Centurion*, 50; the *Gloucester*, 50, Captain Richard Norris; the *Severn*, 50, Captain the Hon. Edward Legge; the *Pearl*, 40, Captain Matthew Michell; the *Wager*, 28, Captain Dandy Kidd; the *Trial*, 8, Commander the Hon. George Murray (afterwards Lord Elibank); and the pinks *Anna* and *Industry;* of which the *Centurion* only made the whole voyage, four of the others being lost or destroyed, and three returning prematurely. Some account of the voyage is given in a subsequent section (p. 219). The squadron met with terrible calamities, but the profits of the voyage were immense, for a great number of most valuable Spanish prizes were made, one vessel alone having a cargo worth £400,000.

Navigation.

Polar exploration, and especially the search for a North-West Passage, also received some attention from naval officers. In 1741 Commander Christopher Middleton, who, before joining the Navy, had been in the Hudson Bay Company's service, was given direction of a little expedition composed of two sloops-of-war, but he did not get further north than 60° 30′. In 1745 an Act was passed offering a premium of £20,000 for the discovery and making of the Passage by any British subject, and subsequently other expeditions were fitted out, but the results of them were, upon the whole, disappointing.

The West Indies, far into the Georgian era, were still terrorised by those buccaneers or pirates whose origin and

history will be recounted in the next section. It may be mentioned here in connection with the work of the Navy during the period that the Government of George I. adopted energetic measures against these freebooters, whose operations paralysed trade and turned many of the smaller islands into mere robber fastnesses. In 1717 a proclamation was issued offering a pardon to all such pirates as should surrender within twelve months for piracies committed anterior to the beginning of that year; and when the period of grace had expired, a reward was offered to any of his Majesty's officers who, by land or sea, should take a pirate and bring about his legal conviction. These measures produced some good results. The activity of Woodes Rogers (p. 31), as governor of the Bahamas, produced others. Yet, both on the coast of Africa and in the West Indies, the evil continued to flourish, the boldest and most noteworthy of the pirates being a man named Roberts, who disposed of three ships—one of 40, one of 32, and one of 24 guns—all of which flew the black flag, and were manned by cut-throats of the worst class. The fall of this scoundrel and his associates was brought about in 1722 by the bravery and ingenuity of Captain (afterwards Admiral of the Fleet Sir) Chaloner Ogle. Cruising off Cape Lopez in the *Swallow*, 46, Captain Ogle learnt that Roberts, with the whole of his flotilla, was lying in a neighbouring bay. The *Swallow* was thereupon disguised, and stood in. The pirates took her for a merchantman, and one of them, slipping her cable, gave chase. Ogle led her well out to sea, shortened sail, tacked, brought her to action, and, after an hour and a half's fight, took her. The gallant officer then returned to the Bay with the black flag hoisted above the British ensign. The pirates came out to meet, as they believed, their fortunate companion and to congratulate him; but, as soon as they were alongside the *Swallow*, Ogle threw off the deception, and furiously engaged both. Roberts and many of his people were killed, and in two hours the two ships struck. Ogle took them to Cape Coast Castle. Seventy-four of the one hundred and sixty prisoners were capitally convicted, and of these fifty-two were executed and hanged in chains on the coast. Ogle was knighted for this exploit.

The Suppression of the Buccaneers.

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY. Exploration, 1642-1742.

THE four generations that followed the outbreak of the great Civil War in England were not interested in the same way as their immediate forerunners had been in the Expansion of England. That is, they were far more busy in occupying ground already discovered and touched upon than in opening up new fields: discovery and exploration have become altogether secondary to colonisation. The adventurers of the sixteenth century, for the most part, become the buccaneers of the seventeenth; there are no fresh discoveries of great value, such as those of Drake, Frobisher, Jenkinson, Baffin, or Hudson in earlier time; and there are no evidences of the expansion of England so clearly marked or so momentous as the beginnings of our American colonies in 1585, or our Indian dominion in 1601. Yet the general progress of English trade, commerce, maritime activity, and colonisation is undeniable: surer, perhaps, and steadier, though less brilliant than before; it is now that England clearly distances all her rivals, on the sea and in the new world to East and West—even the latest and most obstinate, the French and the Dutch.

The Buccaneers.

The Buccaneers, in the sense of Dampier's age, were first organised from the pirate volunteers of Elizabeth's time, when, early in the seventeenth century, the Spaniards abandoned the mines of St. Domingo, and the island was taken possession of by French wanderers, who had been driven out of St. Kitts. Later on, the freebooters' capital was moved to the hilly and thickly-wooded island of Tortuga, which they thoroughly subdued. They hunted wild bulls, each man with his musket and dogs, returning (Exquemelin tells us) after expeditions lasting "the space of a year or two," to "refit and divide the spoil." Their cattle-hides they sold to the Dutch traders of the West Indies; their servants or slaves were often unfortunates, like Exquemelin himself, decoyed from Europe, and induced or forced to bind themselves for a term of years*—besides those "slaves natural," whom they captured from among the coloured races of various shades.

* The English (says Exquemelin) are especially bad at this kidnapping. They bind their servants for seven years full, and sell their persons for debts above twenty-five shillings.

The Spaniards were inflexible in their exclusive policy; and their attempt to treat every foreigner on the coast of the American Continent as a smuggler or a robber was the ultimate reason of the buccaneering league among the more adventurous and desperate mariners of other European nations, who from cattle hunters gradually became pirates. At first these privateers made their cruises in open boats, and captured by boarding, attacking indiscriminately all promising ships, especially the homeward-bound vessels of Spain. They posed as avengers of the Mexicans and Indians on Spanish cruelty, and, it was said, never embarked, at least in their earlier time, without offering up prayers for success, "nor ever returned with spoil without thanks for the same." On these voyages every one had a fixed allowance of food and arms, and the plunder was carefully divided according to merit and rank, after provision had first been made for the wounded. "Thus they order for the loss of a right arm 600 pieces of eight or 6 slaves": other wounds were in proportion. By right the captain or commander could only claim one share of the plunder, but if his leading had been brilliant, he was generally rewarded by several additional grants.

The chief buccaneer leaders were, first, among foreign captains, Pierre le Grand, whose successes made the planters of Tortuga turn pirates; Pierre François; Bartholomew Portugues; Roche Brasiliano; Francois Lolanois; and Mansveldt, who attacked Granada, and reached the Pacific; and secondly, among English or British, Lewis Scot, "who gave a beginning to the invasions by land"; John Davis, the captor of Nicaragua; and the most famous of all, Sir Henry Morgan. This man, the son of a rich yeoman farmer in Wales, first saw service in Barbadoes and Jamaica, and became an important buccaneer through the patronage of old Mansveldt. After many smaller exploits, he carried out a grand attack upon Panama, in 1670: and this expedition re-opened the English way to the great Southern Sea, where the buccaneers laid afresh a foundation for much of our geographical knowledge of the Pacific, though Anson and later travellers often complain of the looseness or falsity of their statements.

Sir Henry Morgan.

He crossed the isthmus from the mouth of the river

Chagres in only ten days, routed the Spaniards before Panama, and sacked the town. After a visit to England, he was sent out again in December, 1674, as Colonel and Lieutenant-Governor of Jamaica, and at the same time knighted. As second in command to Lord Vaughan, the State Papers contain many references to the old buccaneer's stubbornly insubordinate conduct. His old habits were still strong in him, though his hand was now often turned against the privateers. He died in 1688, without having made any distinct addition to our exploration of the world, but not without having played a part in our conquest of the seas, and of the lands beyond in which the new empire was growing up.

Apart from buccaneering ventures, there is very little to say of Englishmen in the unknown or half-known belt of the world from the outbreak of the Civil War under Charles I. to the first voyage of William Dampier (1680). But in 1670-71 Sir John Narborough navigated the Straits of Magellan and the coasts of Patagonia and Chili, of which he gave an account to Charles II. In 1679-80 some 300 English buccaneers started in Morgan's track to cross the isthmus from the Atlantic side. They formed an alliance with the Darien Indians, who furnished them with canoes upon the Pacific. Some of them remained a long time in the South Sea, and made discoveries or re-discoveries of islands lying off the west American coast as far south as Juan Fernandez; their daring and success produced the state of things noticed by Dampier, in 1685, when "the Isthmus of Darien was become a common road for privateers to pass between the North and South Seas at their pleasure."

William Dampier.

With these pirates of 1680 William Dampier made his first important venture. Born in 1652, he had first gone to sea in 1668, but, disgusted by the hardships of a voyage to Newfoundland, he nearly relapsed into a landsman. However, he recovered himself in an East Indian voyage to Bantam, and from 1674 his lot was cast for a time in the West Indies. From 1676-8 he lived with the logwood cutters of Campeachy Bay, and now, in 1680, he was buccaneering on the Pacific coast. In 1681 he returned to the isthmus, and re-crossed it in a march of some hardship, more hazard, and most slow progress through ground still practically unknown except to Indians. For

another year Dampier cruised in the West Indies with pirates "on the account," and, in July, 1682, we find him in Virginia. Here he stayed till August, 1683, when he joined another freebooting adventure, which he himself represents as a voyage of discovery, under Captain John Cooke, who had been in the Pacific expedition of 1680, and who now, shipping an English pilot named Cowley, gave out on the first day's sail his mission as trade, and his destination St. Domingo; on the second, piracy his object and Guinea his market. After capturing a better ship at Sierra Leone, the adventurers resumed their original design, and, doubling Cape Horn, reached Juan Fernandez. There they were joined by John Eaton in the *Nicholas*. Learning from three flour ships they took that the Spaniards were on their guard, they abandoned their first plan of attacking the coast of Peru, and sailed with their prizes to the Galapagos or Tortoise Islands (May 31st, 1684). Thence sailing north, they sighted the Mexican coast at the beginning of July, and with other ships (in all, a fleet of ten sail and 1,000 men) ravaged South America for the next twelve months. But, on August 27th, 1685, Swan, in the *Cygnet*, parted from Davis, Cooke's successor in the command, who resolved to stay on the coast of Peru, and Dampier elected to go with the former, who proposed first to visit Mexico and then to cross the Pacific. Presuming upon the gross Spanish ignorance of sea affairs, Swan and Dampier hoped to reap a rich harvest; but as it had been found off Peru and Chili, so now still more in Mexico the privateers were foiled, through the inland trade (by mules and carriages) having to a large extent taken the place of the old coasting commerce.

The Voyage of Dampier and Cooke.

Wearied at last of waiting for the treasure-ships that never came—rich, helplessly navigated, without small fire-arms, under ignorant Spanish captains, with treacherous Indian seamen, such as they had learnt to make their prey in the West Indies—Swan and Dampier left the American coast on the 31st March, 1686, on their way to the first piece of original discovery—in the Australian seas—that had been made by any Englishman for some time. They reached Guam, in the Ladrones, after a voyage of 6,000 miles, in seven weeks, having but three days' provisions left, and

the men having begun to talk of eating the "lusty and fleshy" Swan when the rations were exhausted.

The immense breadth of the Pacific suggested to Dampier various reflections upon the errors of ordinary maps in computing the various ocean tracts and in measuring degrees, especially between Africa and the East Indies. On the other hand, very old superstitions cropped up among some of the crew, who feared that, in this almost interminable voyage, they would be "carried out of the world."

From the Ladrones they followed the track of the sixteenth-century circumnavigators to the Philippines. But after half a year's unsuspecting enjoyment of Mindanaan hospitality, pressed by the natives, who had poisoned some of their number, they mutinied against Swan, who, with thirty-six of his men, was left on shore. The rest of the crew, electing as captain one John Read, who had led the mutiny, "a pretty ingenious young man, also accounted an artist," now "went," as Dampier puts it, "upon new projects," sailing first towards Cape Comorin. They were frightened by stormy weather from cruising, as at first intended, off Manilla and the coast of China: in the same way they gave up a plan of privateering in the Red Sea, and, after wandering about among the Clove islands, with their "shy turtles," "vast cockles," and "milk-white crockadores" (cockatoos), fell in with New Holland or Australia, in S. Lat. 16° 50′, on January 4th, 1688.*

While off New Holland, Dampier claims that he urged the "mad pickle crew of the *Cygnet*" to go to some English factory, or at least to return and rescue Swan, but they threatened to maroon him; and, leaving New Holland on March 12th, 1688, cruised aimlessly about for two months longer. Just after crossing the line, at the end of April, Read caught and scuttled a native proa "not for the lucre, but to hinder from going ashore." In the Nicobars, however, which were sighted on May 4th, Dampier escaped, or, rather, parted company.† He had only gone so far "knowing that the

* This part of the cruise suggested to Dampier some of his most valuable remarks on the deep seas so often found near high lands, on the want of harbours in lofty, rocky coasts, and the need of level bottoms for anchorages. Further, his account of New Holland was the best English description so far of what was from our side a new discovery.

† The *Cygnet* went on to Madagascar, then a great centre of piracy (*cf.* Kidd's story), and "now lies sunk in St. Augustine's Bay" there.

further we went the more knowledge and experience I should get, which was the main thing I regarded": now he was determined to return to settled life. With seven others (four of them the Malays from the proa lately scuttled, who had been put ashore with him), he started for Sumatra, and, after an adventurous canoe voyage, came in five days to the coast of Achin (15th to 19th May, 1688). Hence Dampier made his way to Bencoolen factory, where he entered the service of the East India Company. He was disgusted with the conduct of the officials, and "not thinking himself safe under men so brutish and barbarous" as some of them, returned to England, by the Cape of Good Hope, in 1691. He arrived in the Downs on the 16th September of that year; and Evelyn mentions in his "Diary" the Menangis islander, whom the reclaimed buccaneer tried to exhibit as an Indian prince.

For the next six years we have no more news of him, but in 1697 he published his "Voyage Round the World," with a dedication to Charles Montague, the President of the Royal Society. In 1699 an additional volume gave an account of his stay in India, and of his shorter voyages to Tonquin, Madras, and other places, with a dedication to the First Lord of the Admiralty, Orford, to whom Dampier was recommended by Montague for the command of an exploring voyage.

The offer was accepted, and the "Terra Australis" fixed as the object of exploration, at Dampier's own suggestion. In command of the sloop of war *Roebuck*, he sailed on the 14th January, 1698-9. Going out by the African route, he sighted New Holland on the 26th July, explored a good deal of its north-west coast, and surveyed Shark's Bay, where he made a lengthened stay to examine the country. He also explored and named after himself a small archipelago between North-West Cape and the Rowley Shoals, coasted the north of New Guinea, and the north, east, and south of "New Britain," and gave his name to the straits which separate these two islands. It was left for Carteret, in 1767, to complete this survey by the discovery that St. George's Bay, in "New Britain," was really a channel, dividing the island into two, New Britain and New Ireland.

Dampier's Second Voyage to Australia.

Between the 7th and 14th August Dampier lay in Shark's

Bay, where he sighted and named the kangaroo, whose tracks, "like those of a mastiff," he had noted on his previous visit: thence coasting on to the north-east, he found the shore somewhat bolder, fringed by many rocky islands. From the strong tides here met with, Dampier, like earlier adventurers in the North-West Passage, fancied there was at this point a way between the lands, to the south of New Holland and New Guinea, into the great South Sea eastward. This he thought of trying further on his return from New Guinea, but gave it up for want of water, a standing trouble in this "archipelago of isles."

As no water could be found, the explorers, in the beginning of September, left Australia for Timor, and after a stay to recruit, set out again, threading their way among the islands to the north-west of Australia, correcting various errors in the common charts. On New Year's Day, 1700, they first descried the coast of New Guinea—high land, well clothed with fine, tall, green trees—at a point nearly opposite to Amboyna. On the 4th February Dampier was off Cape Mabo, the extreme north-west point of New Guinea, on the 14th he rounded the Papuan "Good Hope," at the end of a strait now called after himself; and on the 16th, re-crossing the line, the *Roebuck* passed out of sight of land till, with Wishart's Island, those tracts were reached that were then named in common New Britain, and before this time had been supposed to be all one with New Guinea.

New Guinea.

Passing along the eastern coast of this island, and by the opening, called by Dampier St. George's Bay, which really divided New Britain and New Ireland, as they were later known, the discoverer came at last (March 9th to 31st) to his most important achievement, the strait between New Guinea and the land to the north-east, named after himself Dampier's Passage. It was now that he gave the name of Nova Britannia to this "East land not joining to New Guinea."

Dampier returned upon his course along the northern coast of New Guinea, sighting and naming various small islands, of which the volcanic "Burning Island," a little to the north-west of the New Britain "Passage," was the most remarkable; and with this his exploration practically ended.

Reappearing in England, in 1701, he was condemned by court-martial, 8th June, 1702, for his treatment of a lieutenant, and pronounced unfit for his command. Yet, on the 16th April, 1703, he was commissioned for a fresh voyage, on which he started on September 11th of the same year, and which became famous for the marooning of Alexander Selkirk on Juan Fernandez. But Dampier only sailed as far as the Peruvian coast; the circumnavigation was performed by his colleague and bitter enemy, William Funnel, and the disastrous results of the voyage made shipowners refuse to entrust him with another expedition. In his last voyage, with Captain Woodes Rogers, in the *Duke and Duchess* (1708-11), he sailed as pilot. Starting in August, 1708, this expedition, the one financial success in which Dampier was ever concerned as a seaman—for his fame was more due to his authorship than to his power of command—returned in October, 1711, with £200,000 worth of spoil. It was on this journey that Alexander Selkirk, the original of Robinson Crusoe, was rescued from Juan Fernandez, where he had been four years and four months (February 1st, 1709). Afterwards the adventurers took and ransomed Guayaquil city on the mainland, along with thirteen prizes, and then visited the Galapagos Islands. On the 22nd December they captured the Manilla treasure galleon, and immediately after started for the Ladrones, across the Pacific. Passing these on the 10th March, 1710, they reached England October 11th, 1711.

Dampier's Last Voyage.

After this we hear no more of Dampier as an explorer. He died in March, 1714-5, the most representative figure in the history of our discovery and travel between the great Civil War and the coming of the Hanoverians, and especially remarkable for his skill in observing and recording natural phenomena. It was as the great explorer of the time in the region of the actual that Swift makes his discoverer of the fantastic worlds of Lilliput and Brobdingnag, Captain Lemuel Gulliver, hail Dampier as cousin.

Of the other ocean voyages of this period, that of Cowley, who claimed to have made the first English discovery and description of the Galapagos or Tortoise Islands, off the coast of Ecuador, is the same as that of Dampier, in 1683, up to the parting of Davis and Swan. When the privateer fleet

separated, Cowley went with Captain Eaton, crossed the Pacific with him from the Peruvian coast to Guam, in the Ladrones, a run of "7,646 miles" and completed the circumnavigation by way of Canton and the East Indies till he got disgusted with the mutinous condition of the crew, and left the ship. He finished the voyage home, from Batavia to the Cape, and from the Cape to England, in a Dutch vessel. The career of Edward Davis, after his separation from Swan and Dampier, is known to us from the account of his surgeon, Lionel Wafer. He sacked Arica: felt, in 1687, at 150 leagues from land, the shock of the earthquake that overthrew Lima, and returned by Cape Horn to the West Indies and Virginia. He reappears in 1702, but only as a privateer in the Atlantic.

Of other maritime expeditions leading to any sort of discovery and exploration we have a remarkable dearth. Adventures such as those of Everard in Madagascar and the East, and voyages such as that of William Kidd, are pretty well all we have left to notice on this side; though a word may be added on overland travel, and on the progress of the American colonies.

The apology so long offered for privateering, that had it not been for these lawless adventurers, the practice of exclusive charters to trading companies would have put an end to all discoveries, "and so extinguished that spirit, which is the life and soul of Navigation," was getting rather stale by the end of the seventeenth century, and it was to suppress all such irregular ventures that William Kidd was sent from Plymouth, in May, 1696. At first, when cruising off New York, he was considered a public benefactor, and was voted a present of £250 by the grateful colonists. He now seems to have formed his plan. Shipping ninety-five ruffians as an addition to his crew, and thus raising his complement to 155, he announced that the "trusty and well-beloved Captain Kidd, commander of the ship *Adventure Galley*," was off to Madagascar to chase the pirates. On the voyage he showed himself in his true colours. In 1698-9 rumours got abroad that Kidd had turned pirate himself. He returned to the American coast laden, it was said, with more spoil than had ever fallen to a single captain, and, disembarking at Long Island, was

Captain Kidd.

supposed to have buried a quantity of gold, silver, and precious stones. With a mysterious recklessness he then dismissed his crew, and appeared in Boston streets in the dress of a gentleman of leisure. Bellamont, Governor of New York, met him, caused his arrest (July, 1699), and sent him to England for trial. He was condemned, and hung at Execution Dock on May 23rd, 1701.

A subsequent privateering expedition of a somewhat Dampieresque character is that of John Clipperton and George Shelvocke (1719-21). They were sent out with two ships in February, 1719, on a nautical enterprise against the Spaniards under commission from the Emperor. The ships soon parted company, and Clipperton, after some plundering on the west coast of South America, crossed the Pacific, and after nearly losing his ship at Guam at last reached Amoy, where the vessel was condemned and sold. Shelvocke was even less fortunate. He sacked Payta, and was then shipwrecked at Juan Fernandez, but escaped with his crew and captured a Spanish prize. He visited California, crossed the Pacific to China, and made his way home in February, 1721, *viâ* the Cape of Good Hope. William Betagh, Shelvocke's captain of marines, was taken prisoner by the Spaniards, and has left an interesting narrative of his experiences in Peru. The account of Anson's voyages must be deferred to a later section (p. 219).

Travel by Land.

In the way of overland travel, putting aside such journeys as those of Burnet and Vicey, which were entirely confined to Western Europe, we may note, as rather more of the nature of exploration, the travels of Edward Brown, son of Sir Thomas Brown, of Norwich, of "Religio Medici" fame, in Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, and the Balkan Peninsula, in 1668-9, and of Henry Maundrell in Syria, in 1696; but the bare mention of the scope of these journeys proves that English enterprise at this time was not stirring in such out-of-the-way quarters of the globe as in the time of Anthony Jenkinson (III., pp. 227, 485). Perhaps the most extensive and interesting of all the overland travels of these later years are those of De la Motraye "through Europe, Asia, and into part of Africa" (1710, 1711, 1712, etc.), containing an unusually full and intelligent account of all the countries included in the Ottoman

Empire, with notices of lands as far distant as Lapland and Central Russia. Though of French origin, Motraye seems to have become to all intents and purposes a naturalised Englishman.

The American Colonies. 1688-1742.

Lastly, in North America, the lion's share of discovery and exploration in this period falls not to us, but to the French. Yet missionaries, such as John Eliot, who began his preaching in 1646, did something for the better knowledge of the Indian lands at the back of Massachusetts; and the grant of Carolina in 1663, had a somewhat similar effect southwards. So too Penn's Colony, of 1682—Pennsylvania—and "King William's war," of 1689-97, with the French, widened the area of English influence and knowledge. Of still greater interest is the settlement of Georgia (1732) by General James Oglethorpe, as a refuge for deserving persons who had fallen into adversity at home. Only an allusion can be made here to this philanthropic enterprise—its excellent relations with the Indians, its exclusion of slavery and of intoxicants, and its successful repulse of the Spanish attack from Florida. We may note, too, the various attempts at settlement in Louisiana and in the Isthmus of Darien. But in this direction all effort was closed by the failure of William Paterson's Darien Scheme (1695-1700). Intended to open up a new trade route to the Far East in rivalry with the English East India Company and in retaliation for the injury inflicted on Scottish commerce by the Navigation Laws, it was ill-planned and worse executed, and ended in nothing but disaster.

F. C. MONTAGUE. History of Law. 1688-1742.

From the date of the Revolution the history of legal innovation becomes more and more a history of statutes. The Revolution restored unity and energy to the legislature, by subordinating the Crown to the Parliament. It put an end to the long intervals between parliament and parliament, and between session and session. It rendered almost impossible the abrupt prorogations and dissolutions of the seventeenth century. It made the sovereign and his ministers anxious to comply with the wishes of the nation to expedite business and to obtain by popular arts a

The Effect of the Revolution. 1688-1742.

liberal supply. It virtually deprived the sovereign of his right to reject bills which had passed both Houses. This right was indeed exercised several times by William with reference to measures of grave consequence, but it was only once exercised by Anne, and has never been exercised since her death. Since the Revolution Parliament has met every year, and has sat for a considerable time. The deliberate wishes of Parliament have, since the Revolution, encountered no serious opposition. Ample opportunity has thus been afforded for all the legislation demanded by public opinion, and direct legislation has thus become the normal means of altering the law. Judicial decision continues indeed to be a potent agency of improvement, but it is used rather to define and apply principles already acknowledged than to introduce principles altogether novel.

The Progress of Statute Law.

It is true that, except in the province of constitutional law, few important changes were effected by statute in the reigns of William, of Anne, and of George I. A few statutes may be cited for their antiquarian interest or for their relation to the general history of the time. Thus the abolition of the Court of the Marches of Wales, founded by Henry VIII., effaced the last vestige of a time when Wales was still imperfectly subdued, and an extraordinary jurisdiction had been required to keep it in order. The extension of benefit of clergy to women in the case of those felonies in which it had hitherto been enjoyed by men, marks the completion of a long process by which benefit of clergy, once available only to clerks, and then extended to all who could read, finally came to lose all reference to the clerical profession. The right of the owner of personal property to bequeath it as he saw fit was established throughout England. Hitherto in the ecclesiastical province of York and in the city of London custom had given the widow and children of the deceased an indefeasible right to a certain proportion of his personal estate. This custom was now abrogated in the northern province by a statute of 1692, and in London by a statute of 1724. Merchants and traders were benefited by the Act of William III., which enabled them to agree that a reference to arbitration should be made a rule of court, so that the arbitrator's decision should be binding on both parties;

and by the Act of Anne, which conferred upon promissory notes the character of negotiable instruments. The first serious attempt since the Reformation to ensure an adequate maintenance for the inferior clergy was made by the Act of Anne, which constituted the first-fruits and tenths hitherto received by the Crown into a fund for the augmentation of the poorest livings. The prevalence of gambling in this period is indicated by a severe Act of the same reign, which rendered void securities of every kind given for money lost in games or in betting on the players, or knowingly advanced for such purposes.

Reform of Trial for Treason.

A more serious interest is awakened by the Act for regulating trials in cases of treason and misprision of treason. For this Act is memorable, not only in the history of the Constitution, but also in the history of English criminal procedure. In trials for treason and felony—that is to say, in all capital causes—the common law placed the accused at a grave disadvantage. Kept in confinement until the day of his trial, he had no right to see his indictment, to be informed what witnesses would depose against him, or to confer with professional lawyers as to his defence. At the trial his witnesses were not examined upon oath as were the witnesses for the Crown. He was forced to make his own defence, although he was allowed to have a legal adviser at his side. Thus at a moment's notice, and under the apprehension of a shameful death, without legal learning, without practice in cross-examining, without training in advocacy, the miserable wretch had to contend against an indictment cunningly framed, against evidence rendered impressive by an oath, and against prosecutors whose lives were spent in constant forensic exercise. Persons accused of treason were in a position of peculiar hardship. For the judge was almost always prejudiced in favour of the Crown, the jury was too often packed by the sheriff, and the prosecuting counsel might hope to make their own careers by securing a conviction. In the numerous trials for treason which took place between the Restoration and the Revolution, the inherent vices of the procedure were so much aggravated by the servility and brutality of the bench, as to call forth a demand for reform, especially among the Whigs, who had been the greatest sufferers. Accordingly, a bill for regulating trials in cases of

treason was introduced in 1691, but was lost, partly because the Whigs, who were now in power, no longer cared to blunt the weapons of the Government; and partly because the Lords desired a larger measure of protection for their own order than the Commons cared to concede. It was not until 1695 that the bill, brought in again and again, became law (7 William III., c. 3). It provided that a person accused of treason should have a copy of the indictment at least five days, and a copy of the panel of jurors at least two days, before trial. It gave him the right to take legal advice, to make his defence by counsel, to have his witnesses examined upon oath, and to compel their attendance by the process already available with respect to witnesses for the Crown. Two witnesses were already required, by a statute of Edward VI., for conviction on a charge of treason. The statute of William III. added that both witnesses must testify to the same overt act of treason, or one of them to one and the other to another act of the same treason. Except on the charge of attempting to assassinate the king, no person was to be indicted for treason unless within three years of the alleged offence. Finally, this Act conceded the demand of the Peers, that on the trial of a peer or peeress for treason, a summons should be sent, not, as formerly, to a small number of peers selected by the Lord High Steward, but to every peer who was entitled to sit and vote. Thus the procedure in trials for treason was rendered rational and humane. Mr. Justice Stephen notes in his "History of the Criminal Law" that the passing of this Act seems to have had very little influence on the fate of accused persons. But it must be remembered that the governments which succeeded the Revolution were usually careful not to incur the odium of unreasonable and unnecessary prosecutions. The procedure in trials for felony remained on the bad old footing. In the course of the eighteenth century it became the custom to allow the accused the help of counsel for every purpose, except that of making the speech for the defence. This right was not conceded until 1836.

The Law of Copyright.

The Copyright Act of 1709 is a fitting legal monument of a literary age. Before the invention of printing, comparatively few copies can have been made, even of a successful and popular work. No author lived, or could have hoped to live, upon the profits

derived from the sale of his writings. Even after the introduction of printing into England, a hundred years elapsed, it is said, without any legal recognition of copyright. In the seventeenth century, however, the number of readers became so considerable, that the exclusive right of printing and publishing a book might well be worth possessing. Such a right was recognised by the courts of common law. The common law copyright was in so far more valuable than the statutory copyright which authors now enjoy, that it was unlimited in point of duration. But it was practically of little benefit, because it could not be enforced. The party entitled to the copyright could recover damages to the extent of the loss which he could prove, and it was impossible for him to prove the sale of any but a few of the pirated copies. Even these damages he rarely recovered, because the defendant was usually a pauper. Under these circumstances, persons interested in copyright were loud in their complaints. Their petitions were answered by the statute 8 Anne, c. 19, which became the basis of all subsequent legislation. This statute provided that the author of any work printed before the 10th of April, 1710, was to have the exclusive right of publishing for twenty-one years. The author of any work printed after that date was to have the same right for fourteen years, and if he were living at the expiration of that period, the right was to be renewed to him for a similar period. All copies published in contravention of the statute were to be forfeited to the owner of the copyright, who was to reduce them to waste paper. The offending publisher was also to forfeit a penny for every sheet of pirated matter in his possession. Lest any bookseller should be able to plead ignorance as an excuse for breaking the law, the person having copyright was required to record his title in the register book of the Stationers' Company, which was to be open to inspection by the public. In order that booksellers might not demand an unreasonable price for publications in which they had copyright, the Act allowed complaint to be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Lord Keeper, and to certain other dignitaries, and gave them power to limit the price as, upon inquiry, they should think reasonable. It would be interesting to know whether advantage was ever taken of this curious provision. Lastly, the Act required nine copies of every new book to be

delivered at Stationers' Hall, for the use of certain libraries.* For a long time it was supposed that the copyright conferred by the Act of Anne did not affect the perpetual copyright recognised by the common law. But in the case of Donaldson *v.* Beckett, decided in 1774, the House of Lords held that the common law copyright had been altogether abrogated by the Act of Anne. That Act has in turn been repealed by the Act 5 & 6 Victoria, c. 45, which contains the modern law of copyright.

Registration of Title.

The establishment of the Middlesex and Yorkshire registries of documents affecting the title to land in those counties deserves a brief notice here. The publicity of all dealings with land is so obviously desirable that many attempts have been made to secure it in England. The ancient ceremony known as livery of seisin had, to some extent, secured this object so long as livery of seisin was essential to a conveyance of lands. When the lawyers had contrived to evade the necessity of livery of seisin, an Act of Henry VIII. required every bargain and sale of freehold lands to be enrolled (*i.e.* registered) either in one of the courts at Westminster or in the county where the lands were situated. But ingenious lawyers soon discovered a means of evading this statute, so that transfers of land again became secret, and the bad effects of secrecy were experienced once more. In the seventeenth century the remedy of registration was frequently suggested. Bills for the registration of transactions relating to land were introduced under the Commonwealth, but failed to become law. After the Restoration a committee of the House of Lords reported that the widespread uncertainty of title was a prime cause of the depreciation of landed property, and that this uncertainty might be cured by a system of registration. Registration was again recommended by Chamberlayne, one of the best known projectors and pamphleteers of the time of William III. Under Queen Anne registries were actually established in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire and in Middlesex.

These registries were, in technical language, registries of

* The royal library, the libraries of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the libraries of the Scotch Universities, the library of Sion College London, and the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

assurances, not of title. In other words, they contained a record, not of the actual owners of the land, but of all transactions affecting the land. An intending purchaser or mortgagee would have found, upon searching them, no direct information as to the person entitled to deal with the estate which attracted him, but a mass of evidence from which he might infer for himself who was the person so entitled. An Act of 1735 established a similar registry of assurances in the North Riding, and an Act of 1884 consolidated and amended the law relating to the Yorkshire registries. But the system of registration devised for Yorkshire and Middlesex in the reign of Anne has never been applied to any other county. Perhaps this fact may be taken to prove that it is inadequate to the needs of modern society.

A memorable concession was made to common sense by the Act of the fourth year of George II., which provided that from the 25th of March, 1733, all writs, pleadings, indictments, patents, charters, pardons, etc., and all proceedings in any court of justice in England, should be in the English language only, and not in French or Latin. Two years later the provisions of this Act were declared to apply to all courts in Wales. A concession alike to humanity and to common sense was made by the Act of 1736 repealing the old statutes against witchcraft and forbidding any prosecution to be instituted for that offence. Less interesting, but of some importance to our law of real property, is the Act of 9 George II., c. 36, which avoided any gift to charitable uses of land or of money to be laid out in buying land unless made by a deed executed in presence of witnesses, at least twelve months before the death of the donor, and enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six months of execution. This Act is sometimes termed the Mortmain Act of George II.; but the name is hardly accurate, since its object was not to prevent charitable gifts of land, but to prevent the soliciting of such gifts from men on their deathbed. It has since been repealed by the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act of 1888, which incorporates, however, the substance of its provisions.

WITHIN this period comes the greater part of the deistic controversy already spoken of (IV., p. 566). On the side of the defence there appeared, in 1738, the first volume of Bishop Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses." The second followed in 1741, but the whole was not published till after Warburton's death (1779). It had been pointed out by the Deists that there is no reference in the legislation of the Pentateuch to a system of rewards and punishments in a future state. Warburton concedes this, and founds on it an argument for the divine origin of the Mosaic legislation. No lawgiver not divinely commissioned, Warburton contends, would have omitted so obvious a means of reinforcing his code. Therefore Moses was divinely commissioned. Warburton's work is one of the most elaborate of the many replies to the Deists, though it is not that which has most permanent interest. Two works of much greater philosophical importance came forth on the orthodox side, namely, Berkeley's "Alciphron" and Butler's "Analogy," both of which were written primarily in answer to the Deists, and to free-thinking writers usually classed with them, such as Mandeville.

T. WHITTAKER. Philosophy.

Bernard de Mandeville (1670-1733), was a native of Rotterdam, but had gained great command of English, which he showed in his "Fable of the Bees," first published in 1705, republished with additions in 1714 and 1723. The second title of the fable—"Private Vices Public Benefits," indicates the line of argument. Assuming the ascetic view that virtue consists in all kinds of abstinence, vice in indulgence in things superfluous and pursuit of them, Mandeville argues that if vice were to be wholly suppressed in a State, and virtue made to prevail, prosperity would disappear, and the commonwealth sink into poverty and contempt. Men, being naturally vain, have been flattered into virtue by the praise and blame of those who are interested, for their own ends, in promoting the practice of virtue by others. Against these positions some have thought it worth while to argue seriously, while some look upon them as paradoxes from which occasionally real insight may be gained.

Mandeville.

Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) defended Shaftesbury's

principles against Mandeville. In 1725 appeared at Dublin his first essay, the "Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue." In 1729 he was elected to the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. After his death, his largest work, "A System of Moral Philosophy" (1755), was published by his son. In metaphysics Hutcheson had some influence in preparing for the "philosophy of common sense," but his chief importance is in ethics. From Shaftesbury he adopted the phrase "moral sense." He makes the moral sense completely parallel to the æsthetic sense. By it we judge of actions; but what effectively impels us to virtue is disinterested benevolence. The moral sense approves of that which tends to the general happiness. Bentham's phrase, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," occurs first in Hutcheson.

Hutcheson.

William Wollaston (1659-1724), in "The Religion of Nature Delineated" (1722, 1724), put forth an ethical theory having much in common with Clarke's doctrine about "the fitness of things." That action, he holds, is good which expresses a true proposition. By the recognition of truth, and the expression of it in action, happiness is attained. The intellectual side of Wollaston's theory is that which is usually dealt in; but it has been pointed out that his proposal of a "moral arithmetic" anticipates the later utilitarian calculus of pleasures and pains.

In the "Discourse of Passive Obedience" (1711), which belongs to his first period, Berkeley had already to some extent expressed himself on the general principles of moral philosophy. In "Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher" (1733), directed specially against the freethinkers of the time, he attacks both Mandeville and Shaftesbury. Against Shaftesbury, the insufficiency for men in general of a merely æsthetic morality without sanctions is insisted on. In support of theism, Berkeley develops the positions of his own philosophy. From the "Theory of Vision" in particular is drawn the argument that the objects of sight are a kind of language by which God speaks to men. The connection of colours with the *data* of touch being, in itself, as completely arbitrary as that of words with things signified, no cause of it can rationally be assigned

Berkeley's "Alciphron."

but the Divine volition, which has conjoined certain ideas uniformly with certain others. In style, "Alciphron" is the finest of all Berkeley's works.

To this period of Berkeley's life belong also "The Analyst" (1734), "The Querist" (1735-7), and "Siris" (1744). Of these the first is a criticism of the fundamental assumptions of the differential calculus. These are found to be, when examined, as mysterious as any theological propositions; and thus the ground is cut away from free-thinking mathematicians who imagine that they have in their own science something perfectly clear and self-evident. "The Querist" was suggested by the state of Ireland in Berkeley's time, and is a series of hints towards economic theory. "Siris" represents the latest phase of Berkeley's metaphysical thought. It is primarily an argument for the medicinal virtues of tar-water, but proceeds thence to theories of the *anima mundi*, and finally to the development of a Platonic idealism, not really inconsistent with the doctrine of Berkeley's earlier treatises, but at the same time not deducible from it. It may be best understood as a development, under the influence of Platonist writers, of the ontology which all along accompanied Berkeley's phenomenalism, but which was at first left vague.

"Siris."

The works by which Bishop Butler takes philosophic rank are the "Sermons" (1726), preached at the Chapel of the Rolls, and "The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature" (1736). Joseph Butler (1692-1752) was born at Wantage, in Berkshire. He became Bishop of Bristol in 1738, of Durham in 1750. At the age of twenty-two he corresponded with Clarke on some positions in Clarke's "Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God." What is most remarkable about Butler's letters is the speculative caution he displays in raising points against Clarke's attempt to establish theism directly from a consideration of the nature of space as an "attribute," of which the subject can only be the Deity.

Butler.

The argument of Butler's famous "Analogy" is that the moral objections urged against revealed religion are equally applicable to the order of nature. But the Deistic assumption is that the order of

The "Analogy."

nature proceeds from God. Hence the ethical objections of the Deists to the divine character of Christianity in its full sense as a revealed religion, fall to the ground. All that the Christian apologist can fairly be required to prove is that the positive evidences of Christianity suffice to establish its credibility. Butler's argument thus ranges between two quite definite limits. On the one side theism is assumed as ground common to both orthodox and heterodox disputants. On the other side the historical questions about evidences are supposed capable of settlement in favour of those who maintain the supernatural origin of Christianity.

Butler's Ethics.

The philosophic originality of Butler's "Sermons" is in ethics. The ground on which he argues is that of psychology. Thus he is to be classed, as regards method, with moralists like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson rather than with moralists like Cudworth and Clarke. In his view of human nature he was distinctly influenced by Shaftesbury. He finds in man affections and passions, self-love and disinterested benevolence, and, above the rest and rightly entitled to rule, though not always furnished with power as it is with right, a principle of reflection, or conscience. Taking from the Stoics the position that virtue consists in "following nature," he finds that to follow nature is to obey neither the passions nor "cool self-love," but conscience. In the history of ethics Butler was chiefly influential by his insistence that among the impulses of human nature some are disinterested, aiming either directly at objects or at the good of others, and do not consist of self-love in a more or less disguised form. To some extent Hobbes, against whom all the moralists who argued for primitive benevolent impulses had been contending, is still the opponent in view.

Hume (born in 1711) will be best dealt with at length in the next chapter. The writings by which he was influential in his own time scarcely come at all within this period. His "Treatise of Human Nature," however, was published in 1739-40; and this is now, by philosophic critics, regarded as being, for matter though not for style, his greatest work. Here he carries forward the criticism of Locke and Berkeley to a complete rejection of all metaphysical ideas of "substance" so far as rational validity is claimed for them. Mind,

as well as matter, may be resolved into particular perceptions. No meaning can be attached to the notion of immaterial substance holding perceptions together, any more than to the notion of material substratum. Thus, historically, it is the phenomenalist, and not the ontological, side of Berkeley's doctrine that is carried forward and permanently influences European thought.

Science.

The history of science in the eighteenth century is for the most part a record of detailed research coming between two periods of great generalisations. Hosts of minor laws are discovered, and new sciences, such as chemistry, practically come into being; but there are no new generalisations equal to those that gave lustre to the seventeenth century; and the way has not yet been prepared for those of the nineteenth century.

Mathematics.

In our present period there stand out among the successors of Newton two names of mathematicians—Brook Taylor (1685-1731) and Colin Maclaurin (1698-1746). By his "Methodus Incrementorum Directa et Inversa" (1715) Taylor added a new branch to the higher mathematics, now known as the "calculus of finite differences." This work contained the formula known as "Taylor's theorem," which is of fundamental importance in the differential calculus. To Taylor is due the mathematico-mechanical solution of the problem of vibrating strings—a problem which had already been investigated, on correct principles, by Hooke. Maclaurin, who, as well as Taylor, has given his name to a famous theorem, became professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh in 1725 on the recommendation of Newton. In 1719 he published "Geometria organica, sive descriptio linearum curvarum universalis." His essay on the percussion of bodies obtained the prize of the French Academy of Science in 1724. In 1740 he divided with Euler and Daniel Bernoulli the prize offered by the French Academy of Science for an essay on the flux and reflux of the sea. Berkeley's attack on the principles of the calculus in the "Analyst" called forth the "Treatise on Fluxions" (1742). Maclaurin seeks to found the whole procedure in clear geometrical demonstrations after the manner of the ancients, and, with this object in view, follows Newton's method, regarding fluxions as velocities. In this

treatise he gave for the first time the correct method of distinguishing between maxima and minima in general. After his death was published his account of Newton's discoveries (1748).

Chemical and Electrical Progress.

Neither chemistry nor electricity, so far, is definitely constituted as an independent science; but, in both, observations are being accumulated and conceptions cleared up.

The term "electricity" had been invented by Gilbert, who applied it to the attractions and repulsions which certain bodies, such as amber, when rubbed, exert on light substances. His own work in electricity consisted in verifying and slightly extending the observations of the ancients. Boyle, in a discourse on Electricity in 1676, added new facts. Newton also made many new electrical experiments, and introduced improved apparatus. Francis Hawksbee in 1705 communicated to the Royal Society experiments on the production of light by electrical action. Dr. Wall (1708) compared the spark and crackling sound which he had observed as accompanying the excitation of amber to thunder and lightning. Strictly to our present period belongs Stephen Gray (1696-1736), who discovered, in 1729, that certain bodies have, while others have not, the power of "conducting" electricity. He repeated and varied the experiments of his contemporary Dufay, by whom the distinction between "vitreous" and "resinous"—or, as they have since been called, "positive" and "negative"—electricity was established. Like Hawksbee and Wall, he recognised the resemblance between artificial electrical phenomena and thunder and lightning.

Boyle's work in chemistry, though, as regards theory, chiefly negative, was important. By his "Sceptical Chemist" (1661) he contributed largely to overthrow what was called "iatro-chemistry," the latest of the pseudo-scientific doctrines that preceded the formation of the science. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, two foreign chemists, Becher and Stahl, introduced a theory the distinctive point of which is the assumption that a substance called "phlogiston" is lost by combustible bodies when they burn. This theory, though it was wrong, did service for a considerable time in provisionally connecting the observations made, and was accepted in England. Some of Boyle's

experiments, however, had prepared the way for its subsequent disproof; and Hooke, in 1665, foreshadowed the discovery of oxygen, by means of which it was, near the end of the eighteenth century, finally disproved. Newton, in his "Optics" (1704), spoke of the nature and mode of formation of gases. Upon gases Dr. Stephen Hales (1677-1761) gave the result of his observations in "Statical Essays" (1727, 1733). Our atmosphere he regards as a "chaos" consisting partly of "elastic" and partly of "unelastic" air-particles. He showed how "air" could be generated by the distillation of various bodies, but did not investigate the specific properties of each gas. Before the next period, it can hardly be said that any one has got beyond the tentative stage even of chemical observation.

D'ARCY POWER. Medicine.

The accession of the House of Hanover to the English Throne marks the lowest depth to which modern medicine has descended as a scientific pursuit. There were numerous practitioners of medicine, but they were remarkable for their great wealth, for their high literary culture, or for their eccentricities, rather than for any great scientific advances. Radcliffe and Mead, the two leading physicians of this period, shone in widely different ways. Radcliffe made a large fortune by the practice of his profession. His memory is kept green by the noble buildings which his benefactions raised at Oxford. Mead, on the other hand, lived splendidly and was the Mæcenas of his time. He died a comparatively poor man and the magnificent library which he had collected was sold. Garth, the poet who buried Dryden, Arbuthnot the wit, and Freind, the great historian of medicine, were his brother practitioners and intimate acquaintances. Medicine, however, had everything to learn. Its methods were as faulty as its treatment. An unbounded faith in authority hampered it, and it had not yet freed itself from the trammels of the humoral pathology. The false science of astrology still existed, and even Mead himself published in 1704 a Latin treatise "Concerning the Influence of the Sun and Moon upon Human Bodies, and the Diseases thereby produced," and of this treatise he issued an English version in 1748.

The Profession.

The surgeons were in an even worse plight than the

physicians. They constituted an entirely subordinate order of practitioners, whose practice was largely coerced by the College of Physicians. A surgeon was not allowed to administer remedies for any internal disorder, nor was he permitted to perform any major operation unless a physician was in attendance. The United Company of Barber-Surgeons possessed a monopoly of licensing surgeons to practise in London and within seven miles of the City. This monopoly they were unable to maintain, for the cessation of the war threw out of employment a large number of regimental surgeons who had never served an apprenticeship to the members of the Barber-Surgeons' Company, and who had never been admitted to its freedom. They were, consequently, not legally entitled to practise. They did so, however, and when the Company endeavoured to assert its rights over them, they were often found to have such powerful protectors that it was deemed unwise to push matters to an extreme.

The apothecaries formed a subordinate group of practitioners, corresponding in some respects to the general practitioners of to-day. They were a numerous, powerful, and energetic body, who quarrelled with the College of Physicians, and went near to starving out the superior order, for they refused to call its members in to consultation and so deprived them of their very means of subsistence.

The mass of the people during this epoch appear to have been credulous to an extraordinary degree. The densely ignorant lower class, and even the more intelligent and better educated middle class, believed everything that appeared in print. This simplicity of belief is well exemplified in the affair of Mary Toft, for in 1727 London was convulsed to know whether this poor and hysterical woman living at Godalming did or did not give birth to rabbits. The incident is commemorated by Hogarth in two plates, one of them lettered "Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism."

Medical Charities.

The opening years of the eighteenth century were not, however, wholly bad. They were marked by a wave of philanthropy which has been of permanent use to the sick poor of England—a wave characterised in London by the erection of the General Hospitals of Guy and of Westminster, and in the country

by the institution of those infirmaries which, established at first for the sole use of the sick and needy, have since become, in many instances, the centres for much that is good in the advancement of medical knowledge. Guy's Hospital was opened 6th January, 1725, "for the relief, by physick or surgery, of sick persons whose illnesses were of so severe a nature as to lead them to be deemed incurable." The hospital was built in close proximity to, and partly on land owned by, St. Thomas's Hospital. It very rapidly became famous, and it has long held its position as one of the premier hospitals in England. The Westminster Hospital was of humbler origin. It began as a dispensary about 1719, and gradually rose to the dignity, first of a general hospital and then to that of a medical school. Its founders were a body of charitable individuals who had previously made common cause for the relief of sick prisoners confined in Newgate, The Clink, and other prisons of the Metropolis.

The Practice of Medicine.

Modern medicine may be said to have begun about 1720, It commenced, as was fitting, by a revolution in the methods of teaching. There could be no private medical teacher in London so long as the Company of Barber-Surgeons chose to enforce its monopoly of teaching anatomy and surgery, a monopoly conferred upon it by an Act of Parliament passed 24th July, 1540. This Act recites that—

> "The . . . maysters or governours of the mistery and comminaltie of barbours and surgeons of London, and their successours yerely, for ever . . . at their free liberte and pleasure shal and maie have and take without contradiction foure persons condempned, adjudged and put to deathe for feloni by the due order of the Kynges lawe of thys realme, for anatomies . . . and to make incision of the same deade bodies . . . for their further and better knowlage, instruction, insight, learnyng and experience in the said scyence or facultie of surgery."

The right thus conferred was so jealously guarded that in 1714 Cheselden, the surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, who began to lecture in 1711, was summoned before the Company for that "he did frequently procure the Dead bodies of Malefactors from the place of execution, and did dissect the same at his own house." He promised amendment, "and was excused what had passed with a reproof for the same,

pronounced by the Master at the desire of the Court." There is no doubt that a less influential man than Cheselden would have been fined. His lectures, however, bore good fruit, for about 1730 Edward Nourse, surgeon to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, began to deliver anatomical lectures at London House, in Aldersgate Street, where he then lived, and he employed Percivall Pott, his apprentice, to act as his assistant. Pott, copying his master's example, began to deliver lectures upon surgery at his house in Watling Street about 1747. Sharp, Bromfield, and Nichols were also lecturing publicly in various parts of London about this time. The Hunters attended these lectures, and from them came the foundation of our modern knowledge.

Public Health.

The state of the public health during the first half of the eighteenth century on the whole was good. Plague outbreaks did not occur after the year 1665, though isolated cases of bubonic fever were commonly met with throughout England until the middle of the succeeding century. The place of the plague was taken by a variety of diseases. Smallpox, typhus, influenzas, and epidemic agues, dysentery, diarrhœa, and relapsing fevers did their deadly work, and carried off an undue proportion of the population both in towns and in the villages. The material condition of the people of England was greatly improved by the abundant harvests, the low prices, and the heavy exports of corn occurring from 1715 to 1765. The mortality was therefore less heavy than it had been in former times, though the bulk of the people still died from what are now called "preventible diseases." Increased prosperity brought with it increased liability to disease. The habits of the people were gross in the extreme, and greater wealth allowed of greater self-indulgence. Drunkenness, says Dr. Creighton in his admirable "History of Epidemics in Britain," was so prevalent that the College of Physicians, on 19th January, 1726, made a representation on the subject to the House of Commons through Dr. Freind, one of its fellows and member for Launceston. Fielding guessed that a hundred thousand in England lived on drink alone. Six gallons of spirits per head of the population per annum is an estimate for this period against one gallon at present (p. 136).

The years 1718-19, 1727-29, and 1740-42 were especially marked out by severe attacks of epidemic fever in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Ireland, too, suffered very severely from famine and dysentery in the years 1740-41, and from this time onwards for more than a century the country was never free from the worst forms of starvation fevers.

The great event of the period, however, was smallpox and its abortive treatment. Smallpox has been endemic in England from an early period, but it does not appear to have taken a leading position until the reign of James I. It was then a mild disorder, and was thought to run a particularly favourable course in infants. The mortality from the disease increased greatly after the Restoration, but we have no means of ascertaining whether this was due to an increase in its virulence or to an alteration in the methods of treating it. It is certain, however, that it now began to occur in widely spread epidemics, and that very few escaped its disfiguring effects. The years 1710 and 1719 were especially remarkable for deadly epidemics. 3,138 persons died of this disease in London alone in 1710, and it was equally fatal in other parts of the country; for Hearne, in his diaries, makes several allusions to its devastating effects at Oxford. The epidemic of 1719 was even more destructive, for out of 28,347 deaths in London from all causes, no less than 3,229 were due to smallpox. The disease is so unmistakable that it is probable these figures are approximately correct. Such great outbreaks of disease naturally called attention to the subject, and a determined endeavour was made to reduce its fatal effects. Dr. Woodward, Gresham professor of physic, read a communication from Dr. Emanuel Timonius before the Royal Society in 1714. This communication was dated Constantinople, December, 1713, and it gives an account "of the procuring of the smallpox by incision or inoculation, as it has for some time been practised at Constantinople." The interesting nature of the paper led Sir Hans Sloane to make further inquiries into the utility of the practice. The accounts from Smyrna were satisfactory, but it was not until the spring of 1721 that it began to be practised in a tentative manner by the medical profession in England, though it had already been adopted in New England in consequence of the great epidemic of 1721-2 at

Smallpox.

Inoculation.

Boston. The merit of putting the inoculation for smallpox upon a practical basis rests with Lady Mary Wortley Montague, whose husband was ambassador to the Porte. She had her son, aged five, inoculated in March, 1717-8. The result was successful, for the child had a mild attack of smallpox. The Princess of Wales, with whom Lady Mary was on terms of intimate friendship, took up the matter. Some preliminary experiments were made first upon three men and three women, condemned criminals whose capital sentence was remitted on condition that they were inoculated, afterwards upon six charity children of the parish of St. James', and then upon five more hospital children. The results in each case were so satisfactory that in April, 1722, Sergeant-Surgeon Amyand, acting under the direction of Sir Hans Sloane, inoculated the Princess Amelia, aged eleven, and the Princess Caroline, aged nine, daughters of the Prince of Wales. The successful issue of these cases enabled the operation to be performed without restriction, though the practice did not come into general use until 1740. It then flourished vigorously for many years, until its performance was rendered a penal offence by the Act of 1840, but vaccination was not rendered compulsory until 1853.

State of the Public Services.

We know but little of the condition of the public services during the wars of Marlborough, for it is not until Sergeant-Surgeon Ranby attended the king to the campaign which ended at Dettingen that we obtain the account of an eye-witness. The condition of the medical officers in the early part of the century was probably not much superior to that which they occupied in John Woodall's time, when, "If the Surgeon's mate cannot trimme men, then by due consequence there is to be a barber to the Ship's Company." The list of instruments necessary for each surgeon's mate shows that he was expected to act as barber, chiropodist, and, as he was to be provided with an "eare-picker," it is probable that he was called upon to perform still more menial services. His pay was good, for the surgeon in the great ships of the first and second rank received £17 10s., and in ships of the fifth rank, generically termed "Lyons' whelpes," £6 a-piece in addition to certain perquisites of office.

THE death of the greatest of English classical scholars in the last year of the period covered by this chapter affords an opportunity for a retrospect over the history of classical learning in England. That history has been touched upon at earlier points in this narrative. Before the Renaissance the most notable representatives of classical learning in this country were Bede and Alcuin, John of Salisbury and Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. The subsequent history of classical scholarship down to the death of Bentley (1742), falls into three periods, the foremost name in the third being that of Bentley himself. In the first, extending from about 1485 to 1570, the names of Linacre and Erasmus, of Ascham and Buchanan, may be here recalled as representing that imitative, elegant and tasteful type of scholarship which is characteristic of the Italian scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This period has already been briefly reviewed in the pages on the New Learning in a previous volume (III., pp. 85–98).

J. E. SANDYS. English Scholarship, 1570-1742.

First Period, 1485–1570.

The second period, which is the subject of the following retrospect, extends from about the last quarter of the sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth. In contrast with the first, or *Italian* period, it is mainly marked by a many-sided knowledge of the subject-matter of classical antiquity, by industrious erudition rather than by special attention to the form of the classical languages. Its representatives are, in Germany, Gruter and Spanheim; in Italy, Fabretti; in Holland, Lipsius, Grotius, Gerard John Voss and his three sons, Daniel Heinsius and his son Nicolaus, as well as Salmasius and Grævius; in France, Scaliger, Casaubon, Montfaucon, and many others. The importance of the French representatives leads to this being sometimes distinguished as the *French* period. England was represented in this age by not a few of her own countrymen, and, besides having a point of contact with Salmasius owing to his celebrated controversy with Milton, was connected with some of the most eminent of the above scholars by ties of sympathy and hospitality.*

Second Period, 1570–1700.

* Apart from the three scholars named in the margin of p. 54, Gerard John Voss (1577-1649) and his son Isaac visited England in 1607 and 1629

Visits of Gruter, 1560-1627,

More than one country may claim Janus Gruter, who was born at Antwerp, as the son of the burgomaster of that city, but owed his first knowledge of Latin to his mother, an accomplished Englishwoman. Having been educated at Norwich Grammar School, he was admitted a member of Gonville and Caius College in 1577. He began his University studies at Cambridge; continued them at the Dutch University of Leyden; and finally lived at Heidelberg from 1592 to 1627, there producing a vast number of editions of classical authors, which are inferior in reputation to the great collection of Greek and Roman inscriptions which he published in 1602-3, with the important aid of Scaliger. Scaliger himself, who, under his father's scholarly training, became distinguished for the vigour of his Latin prose and for his mastery of metre, first made his mark as an able textual critic; by the publication of his treatise "De Emendatione Temporum" in 1583, and his "Thesaurus Temporum" in 1606, he attained the further fame of being the creator of the science of chronology and the father of historical criticism. After travelling in Italy with Muretus, he visited Edinburgh, Oxford, and Cambridge in 1566; but it was not until the beginning of the last period of his life, his professorship at Leyden (1593-1609), that he counted Camden among his correspondents.* Taste and erudition were happily combined in Scaliger; Casaubon, who, in France, had been second in erudition to Scaliger alone, but had no pretensions to his taste, might well have been summoned to succeed him at Leyden. Instead of this, he was invited to England by Archbishop Bancroft, and there passed the last four years of his life (1610-14) as a prebendary of Canterbury in high favour with James I. Thus far he had edited Strabo, Polyænus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Diogenes Laertius, Suetonius, Athenæus, Persius, and the "Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ."

Scaliger, 1540-1609,

and Casaubon, 1559-1614.

respectively, both of them receiving ecclesiastical preferment in this country, with the distinction of an honorary degree at Oxford; while Spanheim (1629-1710), who passed the last eight or nine years of his long life as the Ambassador of Prussia in London, was in his old age one of Bentley's correspondents and presented him with his portrait, still preserved in the Master's Lodge at Trinity College, Cambridge.

* Pattison's "Essays," i., pp. 135, 145, 161, 212-5.

But now, "learning ceased to occupy his mind," though "he occasionally thought, with a sigh of regret, of his unfinished Polybius." * Most of his time was absorbed in the refutation of Baronius, the result being not exactly a decisive triumph, although he had the advantage in his adversary's "entire want of Greek, and of classical learning of any kind." † Four years before arriving in England, Casaubon had been in correspondence with Sir Henry Savile, then provost of Eton and warden of Merton; and, in 1613, he was escorted by Savile to Oxford, where he spent many hours among the treasures of the Bodleian; but the characters of these two eminent scholars were too dissimilar to allow of their ever becoming intimate friends. "Casaubon, insignificant in presence, the most humble of men, but intensely real, knowing what he knew with fatal accuracy, and keeping his utterance below his knowledge; Sir Henry, the munificent patron of learning, and devoting his fortune to its promotion, with a fine presence, polished manners, and courtly speech," but "not free from the swagger and braggadocio affected by the courtiers of James and Charles." ‡ Savile was probably, in ancient literature, the most learned Englishman of his time. In 1581 he had published a translation of part of Tacitus; § his "Commentaries on Roman Warfare" (1598) were the first contribution made by England to the literature of classical antiquities, and both of these works met with recognition abroad; while, in 1612, he had lavished his resources on producing at a press established by himself at Eton, with types and pressmen from Holland, a magnificent edition of Chrysostom. Among those who aided in this work was Andrew Downes (1550-1627), for forty years Professor of Greek at Cambridge, "the ablest Grecian in Christendom, being no native of Greece." ||

Savile, 1549-1622.

Among translations from classical authors an important place must be assigned to Sir Thomas North's translation of Amyot's Plutarch (1579), which supplied Shakespeare with materials for his *Julius Cæsar*,

Translations.

* Pattison, "Life of Casaubon," p. 321.

† *Ibid.*, p. 373. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 399.

§ The correction, *Intemelio* (for *in templo*) in "Agricola," c. 8, is due to Savile.

|| "Life of Sir Simonds D'Ewes," i. 139.

Antony and Cleopatra, and *Coriolanus*. A spirited version of Homer was executed by George Chapman (1557-1634), of Trinity College, Oxford, the friend of Shakespeare and Spenser; while his contemporary, Philemon Holland (1551-1636), Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, by his renderings of Livy (1600), Pliny (1601), Plutarch's "Moralia," Suetonius, and Ammianus Marcellinus, earned for himself the title of "Translator-General" of his age.

Gataker, 1574-1654.

The first Latin translation of Aristotle's "Ethics" printed in England was that published at Oxford in 1479; the first English edition of a classical author is Pynson's Terence, 1497; and the first original commentary on any classical work, published in this country, is the learned edition of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, published in 1652 by Thomas Gataker, of St. John's, Cambridge. His "Adversaria," not published until 1659, include many valuable remarks on points of classical learning, and attest the vast extent of his reading.

Selden, 1584-1654.

The learned Selden, who was ten years younger than Gataker, but died in the same year, is best known as a jurist; in his "Marmora Arundeliana" (1629), he produced the first edition of the important Greek chronological document called the "Marmor Parium," now at Oxford.

Milton, 1608-1674.

It was a curate to Gataker, Thomas Young, who was private tutor to Milton in his boyhood, and was one of the five authors of "Smectymnuus." The poet's classical training may be traced in the autobiographical parts of his "Apology," where he describes himself at Cambridge as "not unstudied in those authors which are most commended," the "grave Orators and Historians," "the smooth Elegiack Poets," and the "divine volumes of Plato and Xenophon." In his five years of retirement at Horton we find him enjoying "a complete holiday in turning over Latin and Greek authors"; and, in his tractate "Of Education," his own encyclopædic reading prompts him to suggest that his ideal students should begin with Cebes, Plutarch, and "other Socratic discourses"; "the next step would be to the authors of agriculture, Cato, Varro, and Columella." "The difficulties of grammar being soon overcome, all the historical physiology of Aristotle and Theophrastus are open before them"; "the

like access will be to Vitruvius, to Seneca's 'Natural Questions,' to Mela, Celsus, Pliny, or Solinus." "Then also those poets which are now counted most hard will be both facile and pleasant, Orpheus, Hesiod, Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Oppian, Dionysius, and in Latin, Lucretius, Manilius, and the rural part of Virgil." Thereupon "their young and pliant affections are led through all the moral works of Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, Plutarch, Laertius, and those Locrian remnants"; "those tragedies also that treat of household matters, as *Trachiniæ*, *Alcestis*, and the like"; "those extolled remains of Grecian lawgivers, Lycurgus, Solon, Zaleucus, Charondas, and thence to all the Roman Edicts and Tables with their Justinian." "Then will the choice histories, heroic poems, and Attic tragedies of stateliest and most regal argument, with all the famous political orations, offer themselves"; Logic, also, "so much as is useful," to be followed by "a graceful and ornate Rhetoric taught out of the rule of Plato, Aristotle, Phalereus, Cicero, Hermogenes, Longinus"; and lastly, "the Art of Poetry in Aristotle's Poetics and in Horace."

The list of authors actually used by Milton in instructing his pupils is no less wonderful in its comprehensiveness.* Milton's copies of Aratus, Lycophron, Euripides, and Pindar are still in existence, with marginal memoranda evincing his critical skill; and the results of his reading may also be traced in the classical flavour which pervades his poems. Nor can we here entirely forget the tasteful versification of the Latin Elegiacs of his earlier life, or the tribute paid to his scholarship by his appointment as Latin Secretary to the Commonwealth, from 1649 to 1659.

During the Civil War James Duport (1606-79), Professor of Greek, quietly went on lecturing on Theophrastus at Cambridge; he also translated the Book of Job, as well as the Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, into Homeric verse; and, in 1660, produced his "Homeri Gnomologia." In that year, instead of resuming his professorship, he recommended that the chair should be filled by his pupil, Isaac Barrow (1630-77), but his distinguished successor's lectures were scantily attended. "I sit like an Attic owl," he says, "driven out from the society of other

* Todd's "Milton," i. 29.

birds."* In 1663 Thomas Stanley (1625-78), of Pembroke Hall, produced a celebrated edition of Æschylus, including many unpublished emendations, borrowed without acknowledgement from Casaubon, Dorat, and Scaliger. Meric Casaubon (1599-1671), son of the great Casaubon, was educated at Eton and Oxford, and published notes on Persius, Antoninus, and Diogenes Laertius; and Isaac Voss (1618-89), the youngest son of Gerard John Voss, of Leyden, closed his life in England as Canon of Windsor (1673-89), after publishing his Catullus in London in 1684.

Bp. Pearson, 1613-1686. Thomas Gale, 1635-1702.

Among our own countrymen one of the finest scholars was John Pearson, Master of Jesus and Trinity, Cambridge, and Bishop of Chester (1673), whose fame rests mainly on his "Exposition of the Creed," but who is also known as an annotator on Diogenes Laertius, and as the author of the "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ." Of his unfinished work on the Epistles of Ignatius, Bentley said that "the very dust of his writings is gold."† Thomas Gale, Professor of Greek at Cambridge (1666), and afterwards Head-master of St. Paul's (1672) and Dean of York (1697), published a collection of the Greek Mythologists and (among many other works) the first English edition of Iamblichus, "De Mysteriis." Meanwhile, at Oxford, John Hudson (1660-1719), Librarian of the Bodleian, prepared editions of Thucydides and Josephus; Thomas Creech (1651-1700) produced an edition of Lucretius (1695), which—owing to the clearness and brevity of the notes, mainly abridged from Lambinus—long remained in popular use; and John Potter (1674-1747), who was educated at the same school as Bentley, brought out his "Lycophron" and his "Antiquities of Greece" at the early age of twenty-three, and afterwards became Bishop of Oxford (1715) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1737-47).‡ William Baxter (1650-1723), Head-master of Merchant Taylors' School, and editor of Anacreon and Horace, published, under the title of "De Analogia, seu arte

* Barrow's "Opuscula," iv. 111.

† "Dissertation on Phalaris," p. 417, Wagner. Pearson's "Adversaria Hesychiana" were edited by Gaisford in 1844. His "Annales Cyprianici" appeared in the great edition of Cyprian, published in 1682 by John Fell (1625-86), successively Dean of Christ Church, and Chancellor and Bishop of Oxford.

‡ Potter's famous edition of Clement of Alexandria was published in 1715.

Latinæ Linguæ Commentarius," the first Latin Grammar of a more than elementary type which had appeared in England.* Dryden's translation of Virgil, and Evelyn's "Discourse of Medals Ancient and Modern," both appeared in 1697. The only other names that we need mention here are those of Joshua Barnes (1654-1712) of Emmanuel, Professor of Greek at Cambridge (1695), editor of Euripides (1694), Anacreon (1705), and Homer (1711), described by Bentley as a man "of singular industry and a most diffuse reading"; and Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), Professor of History at Oxford in 1688, the learned author of the chronological treatise, "De Cyclis Veterum" (1701) and of the "Annales Thucydidei et Xenophontei" (1702). The Professor of Greek at Cambridge accepted the "Epistles of Euripides" as genuine; the Professor of History at Oxford, while composing his treatise "De Cyclis Veterum," had taken the "Epistles of Phalaris" as his guide in determining certain points of chronology. The errors of both were, happily, set right by Bentley in the course of the remarkable controversy on the Letters of Phalaris.

Third Period. Bentley, 1662-1742.

Richard Bentley was educated at Wakefield, and admitted at St. John's College, Cambridge, at the age of fourteen years and four months. His own college was prevented from electing him to a fellowship, owing to there being no vacancy in the only two fellowships then open to natives of Yorkshire, but it appointed him Head-master of Spalding (1682). In the following year he accepted the invitation of a late fellow of St. John's, Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, to be the private tutor of his son; and in the library of Stillingfleet, one of the best private libraries in the world, Bentley laid the foundation of his future fame by the study of Hebrew and the criticism of the New Testament, and, above all, by the widest research in classical literature. In 1689 he went into residence with his pupil at Wadham College, Oxford, and thus gained constant access to the treasures of the Bodleian. He was now meditating nothing short of a complete collection of the fragments of the Greek Poets, as well as an edition of all the Greek

* 1679. The well-known "Grammaticæ Latinæ Institutiones" of Thomas Ruddiman (1674–1757), was first published at Edinburgh in 1725.

lexicographers. What he actually published at this time was his "Letter to Mill" (1691), written as an appendix to Chilmead's edition of the chronicler John Malelas, of Antioch, which was being published under the superintendence of Dr. Mill, with prolegomena by Humphrey Hody, the author of a learned work on the Septuagint. Bentley here presented the world of scholars with the firstfruits of his study of the Attic dramatists, while he also gave early proof of his mastery of metrical questions by discovering the continuity of the anapæstic system. In the course of ninety-eight pages he corrects or explains more than sixty Greek and Latin writers. It was an achievement which spread his fame beyond the bounds of England; and two of the foremost scholars of the age, Grævius and Spanheim, hailed him as the "new and already bright star" of English letters.* In the following year he was appointed to deliver the first course of lectures on the foundation of Robert Boyle; and, in connexion with his argument for the existence of an Intelligent Providence, he gave the first popular exposition of the discoveries of Newton (whose "Principia" had been published only five years previously). In the same year, 1692, Sir William Temple published his "Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning," attacking the opinions of Perrault (1687) and Fontenelle (1688), who had recently been claiming for the moderns a superiority in point of genius over the foremost writers of antiquity. For our present purpose the following is the most important passage:—

Letter to Mill.

Controversy on the Epistles of Phalaris.

"It may, perhaps, be further affirmed in favour of the Ancients, that the oldest books we have are still in their kind the best. The two most ancient that I know of in prose, among those we call profane authors, are Æsop's Fables and Phalaris's Epistles, both living near the same time, which was that of Cyrus and Pythagoras. As the first has been agreed by all ages since for the greatest master in his kind, and all others of that sort have been but imitators of his original; so I think the Epistles of Phalaris to have more grace, more spirit, more force of wit and genius, than any others I have ever seen, either ancient or modern. I know that several learned men (or that usually pass for such, under the name of critics) have not esteemed them genuine; and Politian, with some others, have attributed them to Lucian: but I think he must have little skill in painting that cannot find out this to be an original. Such diversity of

* Monk's "Life of Bentley," i. 31 note.

passions, upon such variety of actions and passages of life and government; such freedom of thought, such boldness of expression; such bounty to his friends, such scorn of his enemies; such honour of learned men, such esteem of good; such knowledge of life, such contempt of death, with such fierceness of nature and cruelty of revenge, could never be represented but by him that possessed them. And I esteem Lucian to have been no more capable of writing than of acting what Phalaris did. In all one writ, you find the scholar or the sophist; and in all the other, the tyrant and the commander." *

While Bentley's friend, William Wotton, of St. Catharine's, was engaged in preparing a judicious examination of this essay, published in 1694 under the title of "Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning," Bentley assured him that the two books which Temple had pronounced the oldest and best in the world were in truth neither old nor good; that the Æsopian Fables were not the work of Æsop; and that the Epistles of Phalaris were a forgery of a later age. In the meantime, Temple's panegyric on Phalaris had brought the Epistles into demand, and had prompted Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, to suggest to a youthful member of the House, the Honourable Charles Boyle, nephew of the founder of the Boyle lectures, the preparation of an edition of the Epistles. Boyle wrote to his bookseller in London, instructing him to obtain a collation of a manuscript of "Phalaris" in the library at St. James's. Bentley, on hearing of the proposed edition, informed the bookseller that "the book was a spurious piece, and deserved not to be spread in the world by another impression"; † but, on becoming Librarian, he gave the bookseller every reasonable facility for obtaining the collation desired. The collation was not actually completed, and the bookseller, who had himself been remiss in the matter, unfairly laid the blame on Bentley. Boyle's edition appeared early in 1695, with a statement in the preface that only forty of the Epistles had been collated with the one hundred and twenty-seven included in the manuscript in the Royal Library, *cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari sua humanitate negavit.* In connexion with the controversy which was now imminent, it must be clearly understood that Boyle never maintained the genuineness of the Letters. His

* Temple's Works, i. 166, ed. 1750.

† Bentley, "On Phalaris," p. xxxvi, ed. 1699.

preface states several strong reasons to the contrary, but he is content to leave it an open question. It was Sir William Temple, not Boyle, who was committed to the opinion that the author was Phalaris. A second edition of Wotton's "Reflections" was now called for, and the author exacted the performance of Bentley's promise to write an Appendix on Æsop and Phalaris. This promise was fulfilled in 1697.

Bentley begins by arguing against the *chronology* of the Letters, and by exposing several flagrant anachronisms. Placing the age of Phalaris at the latest possible date of 550 B.C., he shows that one Sicilian city, Phintia, mentioned in the Letters, was not built until nearly three centuries after; that another, Alæsa, was founded more than 140 years later; that the "Thericlean cups," presented by Phalaris to his physician, owed their name to a potter of Corinth, who was a contemporary of Aristophanes, more than 120 years later. Again, the Letters speak now of "Zancle," and now of "Messana"; whereas Zancle and Messana were one and the same city, and Zancle did not receive the name of Messana until more than sixty years after the death of the tyrant of Agrigentum; similarly, they speak of "Tauromenium," although that name was given to the Sicilian city of Naxos many generations after his time. Moreover, the author uses the quaint phrase, "to extirpate like a pine tree," which originated with Crœsus, who began to reign in Lydia some years after Phalaris had been slain in Sicily; another of his phrases, "words are the shadow of deeds," really belongs to Democritus, more than a century later. The author also betrays an acquaintance with verses of Pindar and Callimachus, poets of later ages; and not only quotes a passage found in Euripides, but actually mentions "tragedies," although Greek tragedy arose some years later than the tyrant's death.

Bentley next attacks the *language*, which is Attic, instead of Doric, as might have been expected of the King of the Dorian colony of Agrigentum. Even the sums of money mentioned are of the Athenian standard, whereas the Sicilian talent was only a two-thousandth part of the Attic. He sums up the examination of their subject-matter thus:—

"Take them in the whole bulk . . . I should say they are a fardle of common-places, without life or spirit from action and circumstance . . . . You feel, by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming pedant with his elbow on his desk; not with an active, ambitious tyrant, with his hand on his sword, commanding a million of subjects."*

Bentley next examines the Letters of Themistocles, of Socrates, and of Euripides, proving them to have been forged many centuries after the age of the persons whose names they bear. His arguments, as before, turn on points of history and chronology, and on the extravagant matter and tasteless language of these productions.

With regard to the Letters of Euripides, Joshua Barnes, in his edition

* p. 487, ed. 1699; p. 465, Wagner.

of 1694, had, in spite of a private letter from Bentley, declared that to doubt their being the genuine work of Euripides was a proof of either "effrontery or incapacity." Bentley quietly and dispassionately repeats the arguments of his letter, reinforcing them with several others.

As to the Æsopian Fables, Bentley holds that they are a version by a Byzantine writer of the fourteenth century, Maximus Planudes, who paraphrased in prose a collection of fables written in choliambic verse by Babrius, whom Bentley regards as "one of the latest age of good writers."

Bentley's attack on Phalaris produced a great sensation. Some of the ablest members of Christ Church, Francis Atterbury, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, and George Smalridge, with Robert Freind and his brother John, formed a confederacy for aiding Boyle to meet the onslaught. Their united learning was not equal to that of Bentley; even in humour and sarcasm they were no match for their opponent. But their literary skill and their powerful connexions were sufficient to ensure a wide popularity for their work. No less than three editions of their reply appeared in two years, and, at first, the popular opinion was entirely in favour of Boyle. Pepys, writing at an early stage in the controversy, says:—"I suspect Mr. Boyle is in the right; for our friend's learning (which I have a great value for) wants a little filing; and I doubt not but a few such strokes as this will do it and him good." * Swift, who was living at Moor Park under the patronage of Sir William Temple, joined in the fray by attacking Bentley in the course of his "Tale of a Tub,"† most of which was composed in 1696, and also in his "Battle of the Books," ‡ with its "Episode of Bentley and Wotton," written in the following year. Temple himself, who died early in 1698, lived long enough to praise the "pleasant turns of wit," and the "easiness of style," which marked Boyle's reply to what he had the assurance to describe as such "foul-mouthed raillery." Garth, one of Bentley's contemporaries at Cambridge and a relation of the Boyles, pronounced his opinion on the merits of the combatants in the couplet:—

> "So diamonds take a lustre from their foil,
> And to a Bentley 'tis we owe a Boyle."§

* January, 1695 (Monk's "Life of Bentley," i. 71).
† pp. 51, 65, 67, ed. 1869.
‡ pp. 101, 103, 105–9.
§ Garth's "Dispensary" (1699).

Evelyn alone "stood up for" his friend, waiting till he had heard both sides.*

Bentley replied by publishing, early in 1699, an enlarged Dissertation, which has justly been regarded as marking an epoch not only in the life of the author but also in the history of literature. His victory was really complete, but its effect was not immediately felt in all its fulness. Not one, however, of the Boylean confederacy ever again appeared before the world as a critic,† though many years had to elapse before Tyrwhitt could describe the opponents of Bentley as "laid low by the thunderbolt,"‡ or Porson pronounce it an "immortal dissertation."§ Even apart from the merits of the purely controversial portions, it has a permanent value owing to the vast amount of interesting and accurate information which it embodies on points of history and chronology, antiquities, philology, and criticism—such as the age of Pythagoras, the origins of Greek tragedy, the anapæstic metre, and the coinage of Sicily. It is not solely "a masterpiece of controversy" and a "store-house of erudition." It is also an example of critical method, marking the beginning of the *critical* school of classical scholarship, which henceforth prevailed among the leading representatives of learning in England and Holland, until it was succeeded by the *systematic* or *encyclopædic* school of scholarship, which begins in Germany about 1783 with the great name of Friedrich Augustus Wolf.

Master of Trinity, 1700–1742.

In 1700 Bentley was appointed Master of Trinity. As Master, he encouraged the study of astronomy, chemistry, and Hebrew, and some of his reforms—such as the introduction of written examinations for fellowships and annual elections to scholarships—were inspired by a genuine desire for the welfare of the College; but in many of his disciplinary measures he acted on his own authority without consulting his statutable counsellors, and his rule was arrogant, arbitrary, and autocratic. Serious feuds accordingly arose, which came to a head in 1710, when the complaints of the Fellows led to the

* April 21, 1698; Bentley's "Correspondence," p. 167, ed. 1842.

† Monk's "Life," i. 136.

‡ "De Babrio" (1776), quoted in Maehly's "Bentley," p. 117, n. 44.

§ Watson's "Life of Porson," p. 28. The tardy recognition of Bentley's victory was first pointed out in Professor Jebb's "Bentley" (1882), pp. 81-83.

question being long debated before the courts of law, as to whether the Crown or the Bishop of Ely was the general visitor of the College according to the Statutes. At last, in 1714, Moore, Bishop of Ely, after a trial extending over six weeks, ordered a sentence of deprivation to be prepared, but, before he could pronounce judgment, he died on July 31st. Queen Anne died on the day following. The next Bishop of Ely, Fleetwood, declined to interfere; but under his successor, Greene, a fresh attempt was made in 1728 to obtain a visitation of the College; in 1734 Bentley was sentenced to be deprived of his mastership, but this could only be effected by the vice-master, who preferred to resign and was succeeded by Bentley's devoted adherent, Walker. Further litigation ensued, which was terminated by the death of Bishop Greene in 1738.

To return to Bentley's literary labours. In 1709 he contributed an important appendix to the edition of Cicero's Tusculan Disputations by John Davies, Fellow of Queens', and thereby proved himself the first among the moderns to understand the metrical laws followed by the dramatists of Rome. This appendix was coldly received in Holland by Le Clerc, and Bentley retaliated in 1710 by sending to Le Clerc's enemy, Peter Burman, under the assumed name of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, a series of emendations of 323 fragments of "Philemon and Menander," exposing with the keenest irony the ignorance of their recent editor, Le Clerc. The same year saw the appearance of an edition of Homer by Joshua Barnes, a work published at the expense of Mrs. Barnes, who had been prompted to this act of generosity by her husband's representation that the Homeric poems were written by King Solomon. The work was published in a fit of resentment against Bentley, who had a just contempt for the editor's want of judgment and critical accuracy. In 1711 Bentley's "Horace" was given to the world, with more than 700 alterations in the text, mainly due to the editor's own conjectures. In this work the editor puts too strict a limit to the author's poetic fancy, and thus too often reduces the poetry of Horace to the level of precise and logical prose. But even the very errors of so great a critic are often instructive, and the commentary abounds in unquestion-

"Philemon and Menander."

"Horace."

ably valuable hints on grammar and metre, while in the preface we have a serious attempt to deal with the chronology of the poet's works. In 1721 Bentley successfully restored the ancient inscription on the pedestal of the statue of Apollo at Delos;* he was still more strikingly successful, in 1729, in restoring the text of the eight elegiac lines found on the site of Chalcedon on the Bosporus, and inaccurately copied by Wheeler and Spon, and Chishull.† Two years afterwards, the marble itself was brought to England, and Bentley's restoration was confirmed in every point. To 1722 belongs his revision of "Nicander." Early in 1726 he produced his edition of "Terence," with a preliminary dissertation on the metres, a work executed with remarkable rapidity, in which the editor's genius, acumen, and nice appreciation of rhythm enabled him to restore the text in a vast number of passages. His emendations of "Plautus" are no less remarkable.‡ An edition of "Lucan" was also projected, but Bentley's notes were not published until eighteen years after his death. His criticisms on "Lucretius," which were first printed in full in 1813, led Munro to remark that had Bentley had the use of the MSS. of Voss, which were taken back to Holland in 1690, he "might have anticipated what Lachmann did by a century and a half."§ In 1732 he published his extraordinary revision of the text of Milton's "Paradise Lost," altering "darkness visible" into "a transpicuous gloom," and in many other passages revealing a singular absence of poetic taste. In the same year, and again in 1734, he was at work on a long-meditated edition of "Homer," his main object being to restore the versification of the poet, the rhythm of whose lines was often marred by what appeared to be open vowels and other metrical defects. The restoration was to be effected by the aid of MSS., quotations and scholiasts, but, above all, by the introduction of the lost letter, the ancient *digamma*. Its introduction accounts for many of the metrical peculiarities of the Homeric poems; and

"Terence."

Milton.

"Homer."

* Letter to Dr. Mead, p. 589 of "Correspondence," ed. 1842.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 698-703; *cf.* Jebb's "Bentley," p. 137.

‡ Published by Prof. Sonnenschein in his "Captivi" (1880) and in "Anecdota Oxoniensia" (1883).

§ Munro's "Lucretius," i. p. 17, ed. 1873.

the discovery of this important fact was made by Bentley as early as 1713.* His latest classical work was his publication, in 1739, of the astronomical poet, "Manilius," which had been reported as ready for the press forty years before.

Meanwhile, in the department of sacred criticism, Bentley had announced to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1716, a project for publishing a critical edition of the New Testament. In 1720 he issued his proposals to the public. His aim was to restore the text "as it was in the best exemplars at the time of the Council of Nice" (325). The proposals became the subject of a miserable controversy, raised by Conyers Middleton. Had they been carried out, they might have anticipated in a large measure the results which have only been attained in the present century.

Greek Testament.

Bentley was the honoured correspondent of many scholars at home and abroad. Among the earliest of these is the aged Grævius, who was one of the first to prognosticate his eminence, and who published in 1697 Bentley's edition of more than 400 fragments of "Callimachus." Among the rest is the youthful Hemsterhuys, in whose juvenile edition of "Pollux" Bentley not only recognised learning and acumen, but also detected a lack of metrical knowledge, a revelation which nearly prompted the young editor to abandon the study of Greek altogether.† Bentley promoted the publication of Küster's "Suidas" at the University Press, which was indebted to Bentley's taste and enterprise for the new types which he ordered from Holland in 1696;‡ he also aided the same scholar in 1708 by his critical epistles on Aristophanes, which have repeatedly suggested the regret that an edition of that poet was not produced by Bentley himself. Another of his Dutch correspondents was Burman,§ who shared his interest in the textual criticism of Lucan and other Latin poets. The

Correspondence with Dutch Scholars.

* Monk's "Life," i. 363; and Jebb's "Bentley," p. 150.

† "Bentleii et Doctorum Virorum Epistolæ," pp. 250-289, ed. 1825.

‡ Evelyn's "Letter," 17 Aug. 1696; "that noble presse which my worthy and most learned friend . . . is, with greate charge and industrie, erecting now at Cambridge"; Monk's "Life," i. 73, 153; Wordsworth, "Scholæ Academicæ," pp. 383, 384, 387.

§ "Bentley's Correspondence," ed. 1842; also Appendix to "Bentleii Critica Sacra," pp. 163-180.

intimate relations between the foremost English and Dutch scholars during the greater part of the eighteenth century fully justify the designation of the period of scholarship ushered in by Bentley as the *English and Dutch* period. It was in Holland that his greatness received the most ungrudging recognition, from Grævius and Hemsterhuys during his life, and from Valckenaer * and Ruhnken † after his death.

Pope.

It was not until Bentley was too old to be a formidable adversary that he was at all seriously attacked by Pope, who had apparently been nettled by Bentley's "talking against his Homer." ‡ Pope, not unnaturally, took the same side as Atterbury and Swift, and Warburton and Arbuthnot. In the "Imitation of Horace's Epistle to Augustus" (1737), after criticising Milton, the poet adds:—

> "Not that I'd lop the beauties from his book,
> Like slashing Bentley with his desp'rate hook."

A more elaborate attack on the "awful Aristarch" is to be found in the fourth book of the "Dunciad" (March, 1742), where the goddess of Dulness is addressed as follows:—

> "Mistress! dismiss that rabble from your throne:
> Avaunt—Is Aristarchus yet unknown?
> Thy mighty scholiast, whose unwearied pains
> Made Horace dull and humbled Milton's strains.
> Turn what they will to verse, their toil is vain:
> Critics like me shall make it prose again.
> Roman and Greek grammarians! Know your better,
> Author of something yet more great than letter;
> While tow'ring o'er your alphabet, like Saul,
> Stands our digamma, and o'ertops them all."

Bentley's Friends.

Of Bentley's friends it will suffice to say that, in 1697, the club that used to meet in the librarian's apartments at St. James's consisted at its foundation of Evelyn and Wren, Newton and Locke; and that he was familiar with William Wotton and Dr. Richard Mead. Ten years before his death he lost his friend John Davies, of Queens' (1679-1732); and, four years before it, Joseph Wasse, of the same college (1672-1738), the editor of Sallust and Thucydides, of whom he had remarked:

* Maehly's "Bentley," pp. 113-4.

† "Opusc.," p. 192.

‡ Monk's "Life," ii. 372; Jebb's "Bentley," p. 202.

"When I am dead, Wasse will be the most learned man in England."* In his old age his intimate friends were John Taylor, of St. John's (1703-66), editor of Lysias, and Jeremiah Markland, of Peterhouse (1693-1776), the editor of Statius and of several plays of Euripides, who was among the first to dispute the genuineness of the correspondence between Cicero and Brutus, and of the four speeches *post Reditum*. Among other scholars in the same century, who came directly or indirectly under Bentley's influence, may be mentioned Peter Needham, of St. John's, editor of Hierocles (1709); Samuel Clarke, of Gonville and Caius College (1675-1729), who pays Bentley more than one magnificent compliment in his edition of Cæsar (1712), and, in one of the last notes which he wrote on the "Iliad," draws attention to Bentley's discovery of the *digamma;* Richard Dawes, of Emmanuel (1708-66), the careful student of Attic syntax, who was overshadowed by Bentley and was jealous of his fame; Jonathan Toup, of Exeter College (1713-85), who edited Longinus, and, like Bentley, did much towards the criticism of the Greek lexicographers; Thomas Tyrwhitt, of Queen's (1730-86), Fellow of Merton, and Clerk to the House of Commons, who, besides editing Chaucer and criticising Shakespeare and taking a prominent part in the controversy on the Rowley MSS., elucidated the "Poetics" of Aristotle, discovered a lost speech of Isæus, and, following in the track of Bentley, detected further traces of Babrius in the "Fables of Æsop";† Samuel Musgrave (1739-80), and Benjamin Heath (died in 1766), both of Exeter, and both of them able critics of the Greek Tragic poets; and, last but not least, Richard Porson (1759-1808), who was first drawn towards critical research by reading Toup's "Longinus," and was afterwards led by the "Miscellanea Critica" and the "Dissertation on Phalaris" to regard Dawes and Bentley as his great masters in the art of criticism.‡ Bentley, Taylor, and Markland, with Dawes, Toup, Tyrwhitt, and Porson, have been happily described by a friend of the last-mentioned critic as forming the constellation of the "Pleiades" among the

His Influence on Other Scholars.

* Nichols, "Literary Anecdotes," i. 263.

† *Ibid.*, iii. 147-151.

‡ Watson's "Life of Porson," pp. 26-7.

English scholars of the eighteenth century.* The light of one or two of these seven stars has already grown dim; but the star of Bentley is still shining as the brightest of them all.

Hebrew, and Other Oriental Languages.

Hebrew was early studied in England, but it is difficult to determine the exact extent of the knowledge possessed by the first translators of the Bible into English. A few Hebrew characters, cut in wood, were used in Robert Wakefield's "Oration" (1524), and the first Hebrew types appear in 1592. At Cambridge we find Chevalier lecturing on Hebrew shortly after the accession of Elizabeth, and his pupil Drusius at Oxford from 1572 to 1576.† The history of Hebrew scholarship in England has no event more memorable than the publication of the Old Testament in the Authorised Version of 1611. Among the twenty-five scholars associated in this work, we find two of great general reputation, Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall; among the rest, Lively, Spalding, King, and Byng were successively Professors of Hebrew at Cambridge, and Harding and Kilbye at Oxford. Bedwell was the most distinguished Arabic scholar of his time, while Thompson of Clare, Chaderton of Emmanuel, and Miles Smith of Brasenose were celebrated for their knowledge of ancient languages.‡ An important impulse was given to the study of Oriental languages by Archbishop Laud, on his appointment as Chancellor of Oxford. In 1630 he founded a lectureship in Arabic; the lecturer was specially directed to treat Arabic in its relation with Hebrew and Syriac; and Edward Pocock (1604-91), the first holder of the office, was sent to the East to perfect himself in the language and to collect Oriental MSS. Persian, Turkish, and Arabic MSS. were among the many presented to the Bodleian by Laud, and in 1631 the University obtained Oriental as well as Greek type, and competent pressmen, from Holland.§ Hebrew was included in the comprehensive learning of Selden (1584-1654), who published in 1640 his work, "De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Hebræorum"; and, when present as a

* Preface to Burney's "Tentamen."

† Hallam, ii. 248.

‡ Westcott, "History of the English Bible," p. 149.

§ C. H. Simpkinson, "Life of Laud," pp. 164-6.

Member of Parliament at the Assembly of Divines in 1643, "spake admirably and confuted divers of them in their own learning."* Henry Ainsworth, who died at Amsterdam in 1662, proved his eminence as a Biblical commentator by his "Annotations on the Psalms and Pentateuch." John Lightfoot, Master of St. Catharine's (1602-75), produced his "Christian and Judaical Miscellanies" in 1629. The edition of his works in two folio volumes (published in English in 1684 and in Latin in 1686) includes the "Horæ Hebraicæ," which is of permanent value. He was a zealous promoter of the Polyglot Bible associated with the name of Brian Walton (1600-61), who was educated at Cambridge, and, on the breaking out of the Civil War, fled to Oxford, where he formed the plan of the great Polyglot. This was published in six folio volumes, in 1657, with the assistance (among others) of Thomas Hyde, of King's College, Cambridge (1636-1703), who was successively Keeper of the Bodleian and Professor of Arabic and Hebrew at Oxford. Hyde's most important work is his "Veterum Persarum et Magorum Religionis Historia" (1700). Walton was also assisted by Pocock, whose works include a "Commentary on the Minor Prophets," and "Specimina Historiæ Arabum," as well as an Arabic translation of Grotius "De Veritate Religionis Christianæ." The professorship of Arabic at Cambridge was founded in 1632 by Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Adams, Lord Mayor of London in 1645. The second holder of the professorship, Edmund Castell, of Emmanuel and St. John's (1606-85), devoted the labour of seventeen years to the preparation, and lavished a handsome fortune on the publication, in 1669, of his "Lexicon Heptaglotton," a dictionary of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Æthiopic, Arabic and Persian languages. Another eminent Orientalist, Richard Kidder, of Emmanuel (1633-1703), Bishop of Bath and Wells, published a commentary on the five Books of Moses in 1694, and completed his "Demonstration of the Messias" in 1700. Benjamin Kennicott, of Wadham, spent ten years in the collation of MSS. for his edition of the Hebrew Bible, published in two folio volumes in 1776. Lastly, Robert Lowth, of New College (1710-87), successively Bishop of St. David's, Oxford, and London, was elected Professor of Poetry in 1741, and published his "Academic Prelections, 'De Sacra Poesi

* Whitelocke's "Memoirs," p. 71, ed. 1732.

Hebræorum,'" in 1753, and his "Translation of Isaiah" in 1778.

Anglo-Saxon.

At the close of the seventeenth century the study of Anglo-Saxon received a fresh impulse, the leader of the movement being Dr. George Hickes (1642-1715), Fellow of Lincoln, the author of the first Anglo-Saxon Grammar, and compiler of a once famous work entitled, "Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium" (including a very useful catalogue of Anglo-Saxon MSS. prepared by Humphrey Wanley, 1705). Hickes was assisted by his nephew William Elstob and his niece Elizabeth (p. 152), the editors of Ælfric's homily on the birthday of St. Gregory (1709). About this time a series of Anglo-Saxon works was printed by the Oxford Press. In 1690 Elstob printed a specimen sheet of King Alfred's translation of Orosius; in 1692 Gibson (1669-1748), the editor of Camden's "Britannia" and afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, published the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; and the year 1698 saw the appearance of Thwaite's Heptateuch (or the Anglo-Saxon version of the Pentateuch, with Joshua and Judges), and Christopher Rawlinson's edition of King Alfred's translation of Boethius.* Richard Rawlinson, who died in 1755 and was a relative of Christopher, did further service by the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon Chair at Oxford.

G. SAINTSBURY. Literature.

THE interest of this section, which includes the whole of the reign of George the First and the first half of that of his son, is itself divided, though not in a manner corresponding with the division of the reigns. During the whole of the time Pope's star is in the ascendant—during almost the whole so decidedly in the ascendant, as far as popularity and influence went, that in these respects no one could vie with him. But during the first half of it the older men—the Queen Anne-ites proper—are dying out, and during the second certain appearances of newer schools begin.

The disappearance of the Addison group was, as has been noted, rather curiously rapid. Tickell, indeed, lived nearly as long as Pope himself, who never forgave him the real or

* Kemble, in Michel's "Bibliothèque Anglo-Saxonne," 1837, p. 19.

presumed intention of competing in that translation of Homer, for which, it may be observed, he was in some respects much more competently equipped. Tickell was what the French call a "moon" of Addison; yet, poetically speaking, he shone more brightly than his sun, and he had a singular gift at the funeral elegy, those on Addison himself and on Cadogan being of remarkable excellence in their kind. But Prior, as has been said, died in 1721, and Parnell (a poet of small productiveness but considerable accomplishment both in the universally-known "Hermit," and in some better though less popular things, such as "A Night Piece") in 1718. Congreve and Steele lasted till 1729; but Congreve had been silent, except in trifles, for some thirty years, and Steele produced nothing of moment in his last decade of ill-health, broken fortunes, and seclusion. Of Gay and Young we shall speak presently. But Addison—"Atticus" (it is uncertain whether he ever knew of that tremendous castigation, for it was not even surreptitiously published till after his death)—ended his short and wonderfully successful life in 1719. Of his essays enough has been said; his poems, which made his fortune (especially the famous "Campaign" on the victory of Blenheim), few now read and few need read. Save for that lucky inspiration of the essay which he caught from Steele and utilised, it would be very difficult to call Addison positively great. He was, however, one of the most accomplished men of letters of his time. He had its fullest education, academic and peregrinatory. He had early received magnificent compliments from Dryden. He became a Privy Councillor and a Secretary of State; he married a countess, and was something of a literary monarch in fact as well as in satire. But "Mr. Spectator" made his fame, and, as has been said, Mr. Spectator was something of an adopted son.

Addison and his School.

Although Addison's unkindliness of temper in general, and in particular his jealousy of Pope, may have been exaggerated, and although the general idea of him may be chiefly due to the venomous resentment of the younger man, yet it can hardly be doubted that if Addison had lived he would have been not a little chagrined by Pope's progress. There is no dispute that this Alexander made his great conquest of fame by the translation

Pope's "Homer."

of Homer, which took him nearly ten years, which he began under the instigation and, so to say, patronage rather of Swift (at the time a very powerful person) than of Addison, which brought him in between eight and ten thousand pounds, and which left him generally acknowledged as a "greatest living poet." Even greater rewards have sometimes been bestowed for far worse work; yet it is impossible not to feel astonishment at the particular circumstances and conditions of the success. Pope avowedly knew very little Greek, and it may be questioned, without much want of charity or indulgence in rashness, whether he knew any. The heroic couplet is probably, of all conceivable measures, the very worst for producing anything even remotely resembling the effect of the Greek hexameter. The age was not in the least in sympathy with the romantic or any period of Greek literature, except the merely rhetorical. And, lastly, now that we have measurably raised the standard of translation, it seems incredible that anything but a decent success of literary esteem, and a fair profit from those who use his work as a "crib," should be the reward of a translator.

But everything was in Pope's favour. In the first place, the "Ancient and Modern" quarrel (p. 60), the disuse of Italian and Spanish, and other things, had created a sort of factitious authority for the classics. In the second, it was the age of literary dictation, and both parties—the Whigs before he quarrelled with them, and even afterwards, the Tories, partly out of partisanship and partly through personal friendship—took it from their oracles that Pope was the "best poet living." In the third, he gave them what, if it certainly was not Homer, and was even rather fitfully and doubtfully poetry, was a great deal of excellent good reading in the fashionable poetical measure of the day, executed in the strict "classical" and "correct" sense with incomparable skill. Just as now thousands of people who have very little real love for music will go to hear a famous pianist, so then thousands who cared very little for poetry read this famous, this fashionable, this wonderfully clever performer on the couplet. And when he had finished the performance, he stood alone. Some who might have been his rivals were dead; others were his friends and almost pupils; others were hampered by the hardships which came upon men of letters after their brief and brilliant

sojourn in the sun of State patronage. Even the innovators were genuinely impressed by his magnificent skill and his towering fame.

He maintained that fame during the last fifteen or twenty years of his life by a series of brilliant work in kinds sufficiently different in appearance, though in reality all instances of execution, not of conception or feeling.

His most thoroughgoing admirers would no doubt demur to this, especially in regard to two poems which he wrote, or at any rate published (before the Homer had been very long on the stocks) in 1717. These are the somewhat famous "Elegy on an Unfortunate Lady" and "Eloisa to Abelard." On the other hand, some of those who, admitting Pope's immense literary talent, deny him strictly poetical genius, would perhaps be most ready to join the battle on this very ground. Nowhere has Pope given a fairer; for he has endeavoured to present in one the mortal agony of a hopeless love, and in the other the mixed delight and remorse and regret of a love which "has been blest," which laments "desiring what is mingled with past years" (how pale the very phrases thus quoted make Pope look in comparison!), and which yet knows or thinks the delight and the desire to be alike vain and sinful. Here, if he is a great general, he must make us come down; for it is admitted that in no poem—not in the *Messiah* earlier, not in the "Atticus" of about the same date, not in the brilliant insolence of the Dunciad satire and the gloomy splendour of the Dunciad peroration, has he lavished the resources of his art more freely and more judiciously. Yet one of his stoutest defenders in the present generation, calling these poems "melodious and fervid," admits that they "leave us a little cold." A fervour that leaves us cold must surely itself be somewhat akin to frigidity.

Pope and his Medium.

The essential quality, indeed, here is the same as almost everywhere, not merely in Pope, but throughout the prose and verse of the period. We never, so to speak, get a feeling, an impression, an image, a thought *direct*. The writer in general, and the poet more particularly, does not see, feel, hear, think, and then give us, according to the laws of art, the expression of seeing, feeling, hearing, thinking. He sits in

his library and says to himself, "How can a person of correct taste best present the act of seeing, hearing, feeling, thinking on the part of somebody else who sees, hears, feels, thinks?" Instead of being at one remove only (if even at that, for the greatest literary art simply absorbs the reader in the artist), we are at two or three. We have not even Mr. Pope's idea of an Unfortunate Lady or an Eloisa; we have but Mr. Pope's idea of what "knowing Walsh and Granville the polite" would think it desirable that Mr. Pope should give, if it occurred to him to write about either heroine. That Pope and Pope's contemporaries were not the first to adopt this disastrous prolongation of the circuit, this thrusting apart of the impression and the recipient, is perfectly true; but it is equally untrue that Dryden began it. It is to be seen, before Dryden, in Waller, Cowley and others; and it is not to be seen either constantly or eminently in Dryden himself. It was Pope who, in regard not merely to descriptions of nature but to the thoughts and feelings of man, made it his universal method—a method which imposed itself even on writers so essentially different from himself as Thomson—and it was Pope whose dazzling performance and all-pervading reputation consecrated this method for more than three-quarters of a century, till Cowper and Crabbe, half-unconsciously, Blake in complete unconsciousness, and Wordsworth and Coleridge, as a matter of deliberate crusade, broke the yoke off the nation's neck.

Pope's Philosophy.

By as much, however, as this process of referring everything to a sort of half literary, half social censorship of correctness disabled the practitioners for the highest poetry, by so much did it fit them for the execution of certain kinds where conventional concentration is a positive advantage. Except the "Homer" and the two poems mentioned, the whole production of Pope's last thirty years is more or less satirical—his disastrous excursions into a philosophy which he did not understand being closely connected with satire, but extending themselves not merely to the follies of particulars, but to the limitations of the knowledge, power, and virtue of mankind generally. With respect to this last division, almost everybody now admits that Pope's philosophy is for the most part brilliantly phrased and versified nonsense. His two most intimate and most remarkable friends were, the one a pessi-

mist of appalling completeness in range and depth, the other an optimist of the most confident shallowness. Pope took Swift's pessimism and Bolingbroke's optimism without in the least comprehending either, and made a muddle of them; and this muddle Warburton set to work to justify and clarify in notes with a skill in commentatorial prestidigitation which, if Naples had been wise, would have established him there as perpetual guardian of the blood of St. Januarius. In another great division of this part of his work—the "Dunciad"—it is admitted that he degraded the idea of a general satire on Dulness, which Swift gave him, into an infinitely little, if also infinitely clever attack on his private foes—an attack vitiated not only by the constant spite and motive, but by the double mistake of taking for hero, first, a very painstaking, and, in his own way, very ingenious hack like Theobald, and then an extremely clever person like Cibber. But some amends, it must be confessed, is made in the splendid finale so often mentioned, and everybody has laughed over details throughout. Between these the main body of Pope's social and personal satires—by whatever name, "Imitations of Horace," Epistles to this person and that, they are called—supplies his finest, most characteristic, and most perfect work. Even here, indeed, we cannot use the word perfect by itself. The large satiric air of Dryden, in which a couplet or even a line sweeps the victim away for ever, to an abyss of contemptuous immortality, is nowhere present. Instead of it, we have the stiletto stroke of a bravo who darts from an ambush, and strikes, and runs away, having missed, or only wounded, as often as he hits. It is a very curious thing that no one ever thinks the worse of Pope's victims. In spite of knowledge and justice, it is the very hardest thing to persuade oneself that Shadwell was not an utter fool, that there was nearly as much to be said for Shaftesbury as for, let us say, Danby. "The Master has said it," and we feel that the evidence to the contrary may go hang. But who thinks badly of Sporus, or Lady Mary? who thinks worse of Atossa, or even Chartres, because Pope has stigmatised them? No one. We know that Mr. Pope did not at the moment like them; we have a shrewd suspicion, and sometimes more, that Mr. Pope had given them cause not to like him; and we applaud his hits merely as the

The "Dunciad."

hits of a gladiator—the very cleverest that we know, and perhaps the greatest master of his own special art of line-fence that the world has ever seen.

Swift's Writings.

Far otherwise must one speak of that great friend of his who has been mentioned once or twice already, but also far more shortly. The influence of Swift upon his own age, as far as literature went, was not very great; it has been generally if not invariably noted that the influence of the "world-writers" seldom is. And as he influenced it little, so he was in literature little influenced by it—a proposition which will not seem a paradox to anyone who examines the essence rather than the mere subjects and external forms of Swift's work. The greater part of that work, including almost everything by which he is now best known, except the "Tale of a Tub," the "Journal to Stella," and some of the best of the not highly poetical, but, as a rule, rather underrated verse, dates from the present time—from the Dean's Irish exile—when he had to fill his vacant hours, and, if possible, beguile with literature his immedicable resentment at fate. The "Drapier's Letters" have far greater attraction for the modern reader than his earlier political tracts, and, indeed, are in their way superior to everything except those of "Peter Plymley," who directly imitated them. These date from 1724, almost ten years after the death of Anne; for Swift had been earlier otherwise occupied, partly with the great Stella and Vanessa affair, with which we have nothing to do. Two years later, in the winter of 1726, appeared "Gulliver's Travels," the other main pillar, with the "Tale of a Tub," of the vast satiric temple of Swift's genius. After Stella's death in 1728 he took to light verse again, and some of his happiest things date from this period, when he was already sixty-one, and when the old age of disease, solitude, and misery, which ended sixteen years later in madness and death, had already come upon him. His chief prose works during this latter time were the "Modest Proposal," the grimmest and most impeccable of his exercises in irony, the "Vindication of Lord Carteret," one of his best political things, the delightful "Polite Conversation" (the most good-humoured but one of the finest-flavoured of his satires on society), and the quaint, if rather unsavoury, "Directions to Servants." Of more than one of these, as of his earlier works, the exact date

of composition is very uncertain. Swift, except when political interests were at stake, was utterly careless about his literary work, which he would allow to lie in MS. for years, and not infrequently gave to anyone who cared to take the trouble (and the profit) of printing it. It is not very uncommon to find persons who regard with incredulity and a sort of suspicion the species of awe with which nearly all the most competent critics (even those who, like Thackeray, are unjust to him in some ways) are wont to speak of "the Dean." These feelings will not, in the case of anyone not totally disqualified for appreciating greatness in literature, survive actual acquaintance with his work. It is, indeed, a long and not a very easy inquiry to determine the exact sources of the peculiar charmed sway which he exercises over the best minds; but they may be generally indicated as the combination in him of the wildest and most playful comedy with the sternest tragedy; of a grasp and comprehension of human folly, weakness, baseness, madness, which no man has ever excelled; of an unobtrusive but astonishingly perfect prose style suitable alike for argument, for narrative, for exposition, for invective, for light conversation and talk, and of a most strangely blended character. In Swift a rough and almost ferocious temper accompanied real kindness (even tenderness) and playfulness; parsimony was combined with generosity, ambition tempered by a total freedom from literary vanity or jealousy. Nor is the interest, even in persons little given to scandal, unconnected with the mysteries of his private life—mysteries which have attracted those who care very little as a rule for personal problems, and which, as it is pretty certain that they can never now be solved, are sure to retain their attraction.

Arbuthnot.

The marvellous accomplishment of Pope and the mighty genius of Swift are attended, as frequently happens in literary history, by the lesser names of Gay and Arbuthnot, who play squire to their knight. The four were close literary and personal friends, and are grouped by one satiric touch in Swift's couplet on his own death and his friends' mourning. Arbuthnot's grief is there represented as being likely to prove the shortest; but he seems to have been in some ways the best man of the four, and he was certainly the most like Swift. Until Mr. Aitken the other day extricated to some extent, and only to some

extent, the separate work of Arbuthnot from the tangle in which it had hitherto lain with that of his friends, it was almost impossible, and it is still very difficult, to distinguish it. As Swift says that Arbuthnot, and not himself, wrote "The Art of Political Lying" and "The History of John Bull," we must of course accept the statement; but without it one would have unhesitatingly attributed them to the Dean; and we may still be permitted to believe that his influence, if not his direct work, is largely represented in them. Gay is much less of a mere echo of Pope than Arbuthnot is of Swift. Born at Barnstaple, and of no regular education, he was, with the extraordinary luck which attended men of letters at this time, introduced when quite young to the society of the wits and the patronage of the great. Being of an amiably parasitic turn, he preferred this latter in the shape of actual homes (as secretary or something else) in noble families who petted him, to public office of any kind, and he died at forty-seven a guest of the Duke and Duchess of Queensberry. His literary work is about half way between Prior and Pope in character. It began with the *Shepherd's Week*, a batch of burlesque pastorals (in parody chiefly of Ambrose Philips), was continued by the very clever *Trivia* (on London streets), and the famous "Fables," which were immediately followed by the equally famous *Beggar's Opera*, a thing suggested—as the best things of Swift's friends generally were—by Swift. In these things, and not a few lesser ones, the ease, wit, and neatness of Gay's muse are all conspicuous; but he has neither the most exquisite and airy touch of Prior's grace, nor the deeper note of Prior's rare humorous melancholy.

Minor Poets.

Some lesser poets, as before, must be passed over rapidly: Isaac Watts, whose hymns, famous in all memories as a name, are perhaps still not absolutely unknown as actual verse, while his elaborate and unintentionally humorous Pindaric odes have been read by very few, even among literary students; Allan Ramsay, a fair writer, especially in the rather overpraised "Gentle Shepherd," and Hamilton, of Bangour, in Scotland; Malloch, or Mallet, a literary hack of some merit; John Byrom, of Manchester, who contributed to the *Spectator*, and lived till well into the reign of George the Third—a Jacobite, a mystic, a shorthand pundit, a physician, and a very interesting person; Savage,

the Bohemian and vastly overpraised friend of Johnson's youth; Dyer, of "Grongar Hill"; Matthew Green, who wrote "The Spleen," a small but singularly pleasing production; and others to whom the respect of the eighteenth century for these poets of its own, and the conservatism of school and other anthologies, have given a longer life than most of them deserve, and who, in consequence, have been almost unjustly depreciated since, in revenge for the obscurity into which they threw for so long the far better minor poets of the seventeenth century. But two require some more substantive mention, inasmuch as though they represent much the same influences as those which worked on Pope, and were, to some extent, influenced directly by him, the difference of their tastes and idiosyncrasies reflected itself in the character of their work—in both cases highly remarkable work.

Young.

These two were Edward Young (1681-1765) and James Thomson (1700-48). Young, who was a very long-lived man, was born nearly twenty years before Thomson and outlived him nearly as long, so that he might, as far as mere birth-and-death dates go, have been treated of in the last chapter or postponed to the next. Moreover, his best work was not published till after the close of this present section. But in spirit, literary and personal, he belongs to the period of the two first Georges, if not even of Anne. He was a Fellow of All Souls', but—which was not common then in men who resided after their undergraduate days—he never took orders till he was about fifty. He obtained a college living, but no high preferment, to his great chagrin, though he stooped as abjectly as any literary flatterer even of his own day to gain the conquest to which his ambition soared. He had contributed to the Steele-Addison periodicals, and had published "The Last Day"—a gloomy mixture of rant, flattery, and power—in 1713. He tried the stage, and his *Revenge*, with its character of the Moor Zanga, retained a considerable success of esteem throughout the century. In 1728, before Pope had regularly settled down to social satire, Young issued "The Universal Passion," which was popular, and, in some ways, not inferior to Pope himself. Then for years he wrote appalling odes of a semi-political kind, which look like bids for the Laureateship. The famous "Night Thoughts" (the original first title of which was "The

Complaint") did not appear till the very last year of our period, and was even then not completed till two years later. He did nothing afterwards worth mentioning.

Thomson.

Meanwhile Thomson, a Scotch borderer of fair connections but small means, had come up, after the usual meditation *tenui avena* at Edinburgh, to London, and had published "Winter," his first "Season," in his six-and-twentieth year, a little before Young's "Satires." He was taken up by Pope's enemies, and was not at all discouraged by Pope himself, whose literary jealousy, irritable as it was, had, like Voltaire's, the odd quality of directing itself against his elders and inferiors rather than against younger men of merit. For three years more—omitting 1729—Thomson produced a "Season" a year; the complete set (which, however, was afterwards very much revised and enlarged) being issued in 1730. He travelled for some time as a tutor; but the grand tour entirely failed to yield the inspiration of his native heath, and "Liberty," its poetical result (1734-6), is one of the worst poems ever written by a really good poet. Duly furnished with patrons and a sinecure, he bestowed most of the energies of his not many remaining years on bad tragedies, finding time, however, for the exquisite "Castle of Indolence," the best poem written between Dryden and Blake, which appeared in the May, as its author died in the August, of 1748. It seems, however, that it had been written some fifteen years earlier, by which time, accordingly, Thomson's best work was done. It is in the Spenserian stanza, a metre utterly unsuited in appearance to the eighteenth century, and, as a rule, neglected or completely misused by it, but here perfectly achieved with an original, not a mere parodist, variation.

Reaction from Pope.

There are two points—one of form and one of spirit—in which Young and Thomson are almost equally, though not diametrically, opposed to Pope. The point of form is that both have shaken off the tyranny of the couplet (Young could do it fairly, Thomson very ill), and have returned to blank verse as their chosen vehicle, and to variety of metre by way of pastime and tentative. The point of spirit is that both are once more romantic rather than classical in theme and treatment.

In their blank verse studies both had fallen back on Milton, not without a glance at the dramatists; but Young

was somewhat more imitative than Thomson. The latter, it is quite clear, starts from "Paradise Lost." He has penetrated the secret of the verse-paragraph; he has borrowed many of the minor mannerisms; he has adopted (subject to the influence of two generations of reformed English) the classicalised vocabularies. But he has done more than this. He has put the *je ne sais quoi* of personality into his rhythm: so that Thomsonian blank verse is a kind in itself, and stands out among the non-dramatic kinds of the English unrhymed decasyllable as no others do but Milton's own and Tennyson's. Young, who tried more varieties and did not produce his most perfect blank verse till very late in life, has not gone quite so far nor done quite so much. He is not merely Miltonic, but he is not much more than Miltonic; and his inequality, in which respect he outdoes most English poets, is pervading. Every now and then he has a *greater* line than any Thomson can show. But in this respect, as in others, he is not so good an artist; he has a vastly less sure touch. Perhaps, however, his influence was even better. The blank verse of Thomson, like the couplet of Pope, is rather fatally perfect—it admits of little further variation. The ups and downs of Young tempt to progress.

There is more variety and more promise still in the rebellion in point of subject which both poets show. In Thomson it takes the path of the "return to nature": in Young that of recoil upon the intimate and genuine thoughts and feelings of man. Both, no doubt, still exhibit the force of convention. The absolute veracity of Thomson's observation is conditioned by academic forms of expression; and the self-analysis of Young shows something of the trammels of the theatre, the pulpit, the fashionable essay. But both have thrown off the yoke of "the town," of "the wits," of *das Gemeine*. Once more with them it is acknowledged, as it had not been acknowledged for a couple of generations, that man may be alone with Nature and with himself.

Almost all the writers mentioned in this chapter have been writers in verse, and only one of them, Swift, was a very great writer of prose; though Pope's letters are of excellent quality, and others wrote well. Indeed, it is curious at first sight that this "age of prose" should have attached a pre-eminent and almost

Prose Writing.

exaggerated value to verse. Whether for this reason or for some other, its verse is certainly, on the whole, more noteworthy than its prose. Swift, indeed, would by himself suffice to fill any period, and he had a mighty supporter in Berkeley, the best writer of philosophical, and one of the best writers of any, prose in English. But Berkeley falls for treatment elsewhere (p. 42) with all the other philosophers and theologians whose studies absorbed so large a portion of the intellect and literary gifts of the age. We thus miss Mandeville, a master of rough, repulsive, but vigorous and idiomatic English, Dutchman as he was, and nearly as vivid a realist as Defoe; Shaftesbury, his elegant predecessor and provoker; the Deist crew who wrote and drew down on themselves the wrath of better writers than themselves; Leslie, the *Doctor Invincibilis* of later English controversy; Law, as stout a controversialist as he, and something more than a partisan; Bentley, Leslie's equal in profane and scholarly polemic; the rugged style but admirably lucid thought of Bishop Butler; the smooth, if treacherous facundity of Conyers Middleton; the ragings of the Bangorian controversy. Bolingbroke, perhaps, may be left us, but it is impossible to be very thankful for Bolingbroke. That he was a great orator seems certain, though we have, as in the case of all English parliamentary orators till Burke, next to nothing to prove or disprove the fact. That in his brilliant youth he fascinated and dazzled men of letters, from Dryden to Pope, is unquestionable. That he must have had some strange magnetism, as after times have called it, to account for his triumph over the services of Marlborough, the prudery of Anne, the practised wiles of Harley, may be taken for granted. His own day thought him great as a master of philosophy and of style. But a famous sentence, "Who now reads Bolingbroke?" shows how soon this glamour lost its effect; and though several attempts (mostly due to the whimsical fancy of Lord Beaconsfield for him) have of late been made to revive his fame, they have all failed. Nay, most of those who have begun to bless him have ended, if not exactly by cursing, yet with that faint praise the sense of which his adoring friend and bard knew so well. The fact is that whatever Bolingbroke may have been in his youth, before that Tory *débâcle* which his greed of power and party spirit

The Theologians and Moralists.

did much to bring about, he was later very much of a sham. His Deism, picked up in France, was utterly shallow; his philosophy, in so far as it was not mere fashionable "philosophism," was shallower still; and his very style was pinchbeck, French polish, veneer—not true metal or solid wood.

A very different name is the one great one which we have left to the last, that of Daniel Defoe. In some respects, no doubt, Defoe's political and even moral honesty stands but little higher than Bolingbroke's, while, even putting questions of politics and morality aside, and trying to forget the too certain fact that he at once took money from Tory editors to write Tory articles, and from Whig ministers to make these articles as little hurtful to the government as possible, his general tone of thought is dull, Philistine, almost offensive. But in literature he is a very great man indeed. Born, as it is now said, in 1659, he fought for Monmouth's rebellion and began pamphleteering early, signalising himself in the time of William (with whom he was in favour) by prose tracts against the anti-Dutch temper of the House of Commons, and wooden though not weak poems against the "True Born Englishman." The change of reign brought him into trouble in virtue of his "Shortest Way with the Dissenters"—a pamphlet against highfliers, in a highflying tone—and his already-alluded-to "Review" was written under all sorts of difficulties. But with Harley his politics, queer as they were, were in some kind of sympathy, and from Harley he received considerable patronage, the most important part of which was a secret mission to work for the Union in Scotland. These employments were continued after the Hanoverian succession in the manner already described, the chief victim being the Tory printer, Mist, and his *Journal*. Up to this time, and a little later, Defoe's astonishing literary activity had been chiefly devoted to political pamphlets in prose and verse and to a vast variety of miscellaneous literature. It was in his sixtieth year that he first began the wonderful career in fiction, pure or mixed, which has made his fame. It would be quite impossible here (and in view of the utter lack of real evidence it is doubtfully advantageous anywhere) to discuss the various hypotheses as to the exact basis of the productions which followed. As alternatives to what is, after all, perhaps the most probable,

Defoe.

if at first sight the most surprising—that they were merely the result of an intense talent which had at last found its true way and sphere—it has been held, first, and most improbably, that Defoe got hold of finished manuscripts; secondly, that he worked a sort of literary manufactory with "Man Fridays" at command; thirdly, that he usually had some starting-point of text, written or oral, which he furbished up and amplified. However this may be, "Robinson Crusoe" appeared in 1719, and it is a most significant fact in the social history of literature, that either simultaneously with, or very shortly after its appearance in volume, it was published in parts. 1720 saw the appearance of "Duncan Campbell" (not quite a romance); of the astonishing "Memoirs of a Cavalier," one of the most vivid and apparently genuine military histories ever printed; and "Captain Singleton," a narrative of African exploration and piracy on the high seas, of which the first division is not only very striking in itself, but quite marvellously true to discoveries which have not been certainly made till within the last thirty years, and which then could only have been arrived at by acquaintance with possible rather than certain Portuguese maps and manuscripts. 1721 saw nothing; but the next year was even more fertile in pure literary work than 1719, witnessing the publication of "Moll Flanders," which has been called "the greatest example of pure realism in literature," "The History of the Plague Year" (which, *mutatis mutandis*, may be classed with the "Cavalier"), and "Colonel Jack," portions of which are among the greatest things he has done. "Roxana," in 1724, was the last, and, taking it altogether, the worst of his novels, if we except the "New Voyage Round the World," which is a sort of weaker "Captain Singleton," and suggests, most strongly of all, mere bookmaking. He did much other work, and during the third decade of the century was a distinctly popular writer. Then, owing to causes very imperfectly known, he relapsed into trouble, lay in hiding from 1729 to 1731, and died on April 26th of the latter year in an obscure lodging near Moorfields.

The characteristics of this extraordinary family of unfathered fiction (for there is nothing like it earlier) have been much handled; but, with the exception of "Robinson Crusoe"—the delight of all worthy youth and the not infrequent pastime

of worthy age—opinions have varied a good deal about its component parts. The great longwindedness, the frequently ignoble details, and the want of any distinct and coherent plot or even character in most have militated as much against them with some as their marvellous verisimilitude has attracted others. They do not seem to have had much direct literary influence; yet such a body of prose fiction had at no time been previously produced in English, and it could not but show the tendency of the time to the form. As for Defoe, no criticism of him in brief is possible. It may be said that a man who had written any one of at least a score of things that he has done, and nothing else, would have been regarded by any competent judge as ranking with the best "single-speech" author in our history.

Of the general tendency of the time, of which even Defoe in his obstinately prosaic character is a specimen, enough has been said in dealing with Pope—and of the rising if scattered counter-tendencies against it, enough in reference to Young and Thomson—to make only a few additional words of summary necessary here. Its "Augustan" character—like that, some may say, of other periods, including the first to which that name was applied—was chiefly limited to the perfecting of a very limited and special kind of literary form at the expense of higher qualities not merely of spirit, but even of form itself. The constant danger of monotony was so great that it was, as we have seen, felt, if not distinctly faced at once. But this danger, as is the wont of dangers, brought certain flowers with it. No striving after perfection, however low a kind of perfection it may be—and though from time to time attempts are made to show that this was not low, they may be dismissed as mere juvenile paradox—is ever without "certain condolences, certain vails" to its lowness. The slightly narrow and conventional badinage of the essayists was redeemed not merely by an exquisite concinnity of expression, a great fineness of observation, but by a sound if not very acute sense, a pure if not very elevated morality, a wholesome, kindly spirit, which kept England throughout this century of plain thinking and high living from the mischiefs which waited on it in France and elsewhere. The satire and moralising of Pope, inferior to the work of Steele and Addison in healthiness and wholesomeness, displayed not

merely an almost diabolic cleverness of craftsmanship, but a grace, an elegance, a completeness of air and atmosphere which were, if not angelic, at least sylph-like enough. This was the saving grace of the Augustans' error, the solace of their sin.

R. HUGHES. Art: Painting.

George I., a small German despot, called by chance to the throne of free England, was not predisposed to foster anything whatever in a country which he hated, and in which he felt his stay to be precarious. Such taste for luxury as he had was formed on the model of his elderly enemy Louis XIV., and his palace at Herrenhausen, both in its live and dead ornaments, was a vulgar German travesty of Versailles. But neither in England nor in Hanover did he make any serious attempt to imitate the Grand Monarque in the intelligent patronage of art and artists. George came to the throne in 1714, a year in which at least one true artist, Richard Wilson, first saw the light. Joshua Reynolds was born in the tenth year of his reign; while 1727, the year of his death, was also the year of Gainsborough's birth. But for this accident there is little to connect the first of the House of Guelph with English art, which was never more completely at a standstill than during his reign.

Foreign Artists.

Of course, many artists of the preceding reigns worked on. Till 1723 the clever, swaggering Kneller continued to send out the uncertain manufactures of his studio, and the honest but uninspired Dahl painted steadily till the middle of the century. Indeed, the work of Dahl, as seen in the gallery at Petworth, was probably the most meritorious of the reign. Laguerre also, who had been the assistant and pupil, and finally the rival, of Verrio, continued to paint the sprawling saints of his master on the ceilings of the great. He was, in fact, chosen to decorate the inside of the Cupola of St. Paul's, although set aside in favour of a younger man. This man (Thornhill), born in 1676, was his junior by thirteen years. He was an Englishman of good family settled in the neighbourhood of Melcombe Regis. He succeeded Sir Christopher Wren as member for that borough, and was knighted in 1715. Like many of the

English artists of the period he was originally an amateur, and his deficient training was not counterbalanced by natural gifts. He was accused of employing "ghosts," particularly one Thomas Gibson, and he doubtless owed something to his assistance. He is remembered to some extent by his decoration of the dome of St. Paul's and the Hall at Greenwich, but chiefly owing to the fact that he was the friend and father-in-law of Hogarth. The commission for St. Paul's, given in the reign of Queen Anne, was, as we have said, destined for Laguerre, but was wrested from him by Thornhill, rather, it would seem, because he was something of a man of fashion than on any ground of superiority as an artist. Perhaps it was well, for if he were not to have the mosaics contemplated by Wren, at any rate Thornhill's *chiaroscuro* was better than Laguerre's colour. He was not without invention, of the large but insipid character, that perhaps finds its fullest expression in the work of Le Sueur. Thornhill's allegorical painting in the Hall of Greenwich Hospital most favourably gauges his talent. It is cold and pretentious enough; King William and Queen Mary, attended by Hymen and the Virtues, giving peace to Europe; Apollo driving among the Signs of the Zodiac; the four elements in the angles, and fancy portraits of astronomers between the colossal figures which support the balustrade. Young tells us

Thornhill.

"How Raffaelle's pencil lives in Thornhill's hand."

—not, it may be assumed, with Raffaelle's approval.

This was, as we have indicated above, rather an era of gentleman amateurs, but it must be admitted that they were mediocre artists. Of those who then flourished (if the phrase be permissible) the most important names are Jervas and Richardson. The former enjoyed the friendship of Pope, and gave him lessons in painting. He was repaid in the most fulsome flattery, for the poet ventured to write of his portrait of Lady Bridgwater (daughter of the great Duke of Marlborough),

Amateur Artists.

"With Zeuxis' Helen thy Bridgwater vies."

A somewhat stronger artist was Jonathan Richardson, who "arrived" a little late, having been born in 1665. He became the pupil of Riley, and after the decline of Kneller and Dahl,

divided with Jervas the position of the leading portrait painter of England. Both Jervas and Richardson were men of literary tastes and consorted with men of letters. Jervas translated "Don Quixote," and Richardson published essays on "The Whole Art of Criticism," on the "Theory of Painting," and various sketches of travel and notes on Milton. His daughter was married to Hudson, who had the honour of being the master of Sir Joshua Reynolds; and Reynolds, we know, had a high opinion, if not of Richardson's art, at least of his learning. His best-known portrait is that of Matthew Prior, the poet, now preserved in the Bodleian Library.

Foreign Artists.

Among eminent foreigners who secured English patronage in this reign were the Dutchman Dietrich Netscher, the son of Kaspar; Balthazar Denner, of Altona, the most laborious of all painters of the human countenance; and Peter Tillemans, of Antwerp, who had much employment among the English aristocracy as a copyist, teacher, and painter of landscape. Zincke, a miniaturist and enameller of the school of Petitot, commenced his career in this reign, though his fame in England dates half a century later. Peter Monamy, too, repeated, and occasionally with quite extraordinary success, the touch of the sea-painters of the family of Vandevelde. For a year or two in this reign the famous Swiss—or rather Genevan—*pastelliste*, Leotard, was in England, and his highly elaborate and accurate, if rather monotonous, hand was not without influence on the English workers in pastel.

Sculpture.

Sculpture, even more than other branches of art, continued to depend on foreigners, though the home taste for monumental marbles never at any time quite died out. Among its most eminent professors in the last years of George II. were John Michael Rysbrach and Peter Scheemaker. The first-named was a Belgian, whose skill was at first exploited by the architect Gibbs, as Scheemaker's was by Kent. Both he and Scheemaker, who also came from the Low Countries, were thoroughly competent workmen, and both had considerable vogue. Another and a greater name is that of Roubilliac, a native of Lyons. He executed several works in marble, characterised by a dignity and vigour rare in his age. Among these the monument to the Duke of Argyll, at Westminster, and

to Sir Isaac Newton, at Cambridge, are the most celebrated. Another statue of his—one of Handel the composer, executed for Vauxhall Gardens—excited the enthusiasm and admiration of the sculptor Nollekens. He was at the head of his profession in England, and verily towers among the sculptors of this and, indeed, of the succeeding reign, during the latter of which his most important works were executed.

F. J. CROWEST. Handel and English Music.

HANDEL stands the most remarkable musical figure of the eighteenth century. The son of a surgeon, he was born at Halle, in Lower Saxony, on February 23rd, 1685. His father did not intend him for a musician, and it was one of the favouring episodes leading up to his high summit of artistic fame that brought him into contact with his first music-master, Zachau, organist of Halle Cathedral. After a course of study and experience in Germany, Handel visited Italy, for he perceived that the Italian musical manner contained much that was akin to his own conception of art. It was, indeed, in the happy combination of the German and Italian styles that the secret of his subsequent grand success proved to exist. After three years in Italy, Handel returned home, to become *capellmeister—i.e.* master of the band and music—to the Elector of Hanover, afterwards George I. This was in 1709. The following year Handel visited England, and, like many others before and after him, was favourably impressed with the musical prospects here. Italian opera was then the new thing, which by means of travelling companies was fast making its way over Europe. It had been introduced into England as early as 1706, when *Arsinoe* was produced at Drury Lane Theatre, with English words. In the short space of fourteen days Handel composed *Rinaldo*, which was produced at the Haymarket Theatre on the 24th February, 1711. Although sneered at by *literati* and wits of the time, the public at large received it with acclamation. *Rinaldo* had no new forms, but the beauty and originality of its music, together with the splendour of its decorations, created a great sensation. Undoubtedly it was the finest opera that had, up to that time, been produced on any stage. Its success decided

Handel's Early Career.

Handel's future so far as his home was concerned; he determined to take up his residence permanently in England. Musical art here was at low ebb. Elizabethan music was forgotten. During the Civil War the practice, as well as the material, of music had suffered (IV., p. 400). Nor did the Restoration period repair the mischief—since Church music of the French style and flimsy masques were little calculated to put music in England upon any sound footing. The conditions were singularly favourable, therefore, to Handel's abode here; and for seven years he found ample musical work at the Court and among the aristocracy.

Settlement in England.

With the year 1721 Handel entered upon an undertaking which brought him prominently to the front in English musical matters, and led him, eventually, into becoming an important public man in English society, as well as a great figure between two rival factions of the operatic world. A section of the nobility decided to establish Italian opera here, and Handel was selected as conductor and manager for the venture, which was started at the Haymarket Theatre, under the unhappy title of "The Royal Academy of Music." Having engaged a company of Italian singers, which included Durastanti and an artificial soprano named Senesino—for men then sang the women's parts—Handel composed in quick succession *Radamisto, Muzio Scævola, Floridante, Ottone, Flavio, Giulio Cæsare, Tamerlano, Rodelinda, Scipione, Alessandro, Admeto, Riccardo Primo, Siroe,* and *Tolomeo*—all of them operas on the sparse Italian model of the period. These works were more or less successful, but, despite Handel's industry and assiduity at composition, the operatic scheme did not prove a success. Handel had not been long at the helm before he had to encounter some of those shoals which embarrass every manager and *impresario.* Patrons and singers began to have whims and to show their tempers, and Handel, with his rough independence and want of respect, was not the man to tolerate much interference. His method was inartistic but thorough. "If you vill not sing vat I do write, I vill take you by ze vaist and throw you out of de vindow," was the kind of alternative with which he confronted those songstresses of his company who dared to disregard his wishes. Needless to say

Handel as an Operatic Composer.

that such want of tact only hastened a climax which was reached during the 1728 season, when a disgraceful public squabble between the singers Cuzzoni and Faustina—supported by their respective factions—took place on the stage of the Haymarket Theatre. Then the company was dissolved.

The following year another scheme was afloat. Handel and Heidegger—known in theatrical annals as the ugliest man in Europe—co-operated and took the King's Theatre in the Haymarket. For this enterprise the persevering musician found new performers and composed new operas—*Lothario, Parthenope, Porus, Ætius, Sosarme,* and *Orlando;* but he seemed beset with opposition, which, growing stronger and stronger, forced him to abandon the partnership. This was in 1734. Discouraged, but not defeated, the resolute musician ventured yet a third effort with opera—this time solely on his own account—despite a strong opposition of aristocracy and singers pledged to ruin him. He had fallen out with Senesino—one of those famous sopranist singers that figured in the opera performances of the time. Senesino was arrogant and imperious, but he was also the spoiled idol of the fashionable world; the rupture with Handel, therefore, meant mischief. The singer found many friends who demanded redress for him, but Handel positively refused. He swore that Senesino should never appear in his theatre again, and the irate musician kept his word. Senesino's friends, therefore, opened a new house for opera at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Journeying to Italy, Handel secured fresh artists and brought them to London, having, in the meanwhile, secured Covent Garden Theatre. He wrote new operas — *Semiramis, Arbaces, Ariadne, Pastor Fido, Dido, Berenice, Xerxes,* and *Alexander's Feast;* besides which he threw his whole energies, as well as his fortune, into the concern. Yet all failed. Disappointed, worn out in mind and body, and a bankrupt, Handel took refuge at Aix-la-Chapelle. This was in 1737.

His Failure.

Handel wrote forty-two operas. Though they are marked by much that is truly Handelian, they are not structurally different from the Italian forms of the time. He was decidedly conservative in opera. Thus he followed the style of his predecessors in making the voice and the solos the sole features, but he introduced little or no reform. The article that he produced

Character of his Operas.

was exactly to the liking of the Italians, so that they styled him the "caro Sassone"—which was no small achievement for a German musician. If, however, there was no advance in opera form, the dramatic expression in these works far surpassed everything that had previously been attempted. In early opera expression and colour were conspicuous by their absence, but Handel put an end to this. *Rinaldo* eclipsed all previous Italian operas in its illustrative colouring, and this property, which emanated not from the singer nor scenic artist but from the composer, Handel maintained throughout all his writings for the stage. It was in the songs —not in the choruses, as in his oratorios—that his rare genius was so apparent. Distinguished by masterly judgment in the expression of the words, combined with much melodic sympathy and pathos, the songs in these operas might be revived to-day—a few are—without fear of offence. Amid such an *embarras des richesses* it is difficult to make a selection; but such airs as "Caro vieni a me" (*Riccardo Primo*), which Signorina Cuzzoni used to sing; "Vieni torna Idolo mio" (*Teseo*), "Cuor di madre, E cuor di miglie" (*Sosarme*), "Bel piacer" (*Rinaldo*), and "Il tricerbero umiliato" (*Rinaldo*), show something of that freshness, feeling, symmetry, and adaptability for the voice which rendered them superior to everything that had preceded them. The free and descriptive accompaniments, too, were as new and remarkable as the songs themselves, and with the many beautiful obbligato parts and choice devices for brass, reed, and string instruments, must have charmed listeners with whom such skilled and advanced orchestration was a novelty. Despite songs, orchestral accompaniments, and slight improvements upon existing methods, such as the introduction of a quartet in the third act of *Radamisto;* the two airs *in succession* given to the principal parts in *Teseo*—quite an unorthodox proceeding; despite the repeated proofs he gave of being a leader in opera, Handel could do nothing with it here. The bombast and exaggeration ill accorded with the national seriousness; thus the violent love-scenes, men singing women's parts, the tragic methods—all fell flat with the English people. What they wanted was English opera, and Purcell they knew not. Handel failed in Italian opera, and his contributions to its *répertoire* are to-day no more highly regarded on the Continent than they are here.

The world had not yet seen the true Handel. Recovering his health, his thoughts turned from secular to sacred art, for which his early training eminently fitted him. He had been brought up a Lutheran, and the circumstances into which he was thrown impressed him with the real and earnest in art. The noble language of the Bible, and its solemn truths, seemed to the master to be alone adequate to the mood in which he now was for composition. Hence arose those grand conceptions—the oratorios—which have immortalised his name, and with which he has exercised his vast influence upon musical England. The novelty of this sacred music consisted in the fact that it was not for the church, as the oratorio had hitherto been, but was to be on such a scale as to be performed in the theatre. The master had prefaced his efforts in the direction of oratorio with two compositions—the *Johannis Passion* (1704) and an Italian oratorio, *La Ressurezione* (1708). Now he was to engage upon those masterly examples of sacred art which at once gave him a place above all composers of the eighteenth century. *Saul* was composed and produced with marked success at the Haymarket Theatre in 1739; then, with that fecundity which is a sure sign of genius, Handel wrote *Israel in Egypt* (1739), the *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day* and *L'Allegro ed Il Penseroso* (1740), that king of *oratorii—The Messiah* (1741), *Samson* (1743), *Joseph* (1744), *Judas Maccabæus* (1747), *Joshua* (1747), *Solomon* (1748), *Theodora* (1749), *Jephtha* (1751), and several others.

His Oratorios.

These are the scores that have made Handel immortal. He did not invent the oratorio, since it had its origin in Italy; but he took it to that high point of perfection where it becomes the ideal goal of every great musician, and which one only—Mendelssohn—has seriously approached. It is amazing that such works should emanate from a man who was over fifty-four years of age; it is not less surprising, considering the strong opposition that existed among the aristocracy, that Handel was able to induce audiences to listen to, and to restore his lost fortune with, compositions which were not moulded for the habitual pleasure-seeker. But the master did not seek the ear of the aristocracy; he appealed to the great middle-class of England, and it was this public which then, as now,

His Public.

gave its approval to his sacred music—music which has revolutionised the whole musical thought and tendency of England. The intrinsic merit of Handel's oratorios is indeed considerable, but it is not altogether the composer's personality, nor the introduction of novel vocal and instrumental methods into them, which render them such abiding examples of art. Their reasonableness of construction, and the masterly combination of the German and Italian styles characterising them, constitute their chief feature outside their loftiness and beauty. For their predominating flavour Handel was wholly indebted to Purcell. The conception of the new scope for oratorio was a great thing, but it was more to make it artistically comprehensive and perfect. Several qualities served Handel. Up to his day the stern, severe, colourless style of Palestrina had reigned in sacred music for two hundred years. The only exception was the English School. Suddenly Handel burst in upon the musical firmament with all his wealth of colour and dramatic expression. This was an immense gain and meant a vast stride in music. His tone-painting was a revelation to the age which first realised it, and, while it lifted musical art over a gap of two centuries, it formed the starting point from which vaster results were to follow in works by Beethoven, Schumann, and others. Handel sought to represent such natural objects as the singing of birds, the flowing of fountains, etc., in his operas; but when we come to his oratorios he is even more of an expressionist. His tone-painting extends to pictures like the sun standing still, the Red Sea cleft by a miracle, a darkness to be felt, etc. Every shade of expression can be found studded throughout his oratorios. There is page after page of matchless musical painting in *Israel in Egypt*, the Jupiter of oratorios; the local colour in the *Messiah*, and such beautiful and expressive pieces as "Deeper and deeper still," "Waft her, angels," "There were shepherds abiding in the fields," are well known to those who follow Handel's music. No piece of descriptive music has ever become so familiar, probably, as the "Dead March" in *Saul*. This great colouring gift—so admired, and so essential to make music the living power that it should be—Handel devoted to the art two hundred years ago. No wonder that he rose above all other musicians of his day and

Character of his Sacred Music.

won the reputation of being indisputably the first musician in Europe. Nor is it surprising that his music is ever spreading and becoming more and more generally known; for it possesses living qualities which will ever keep it from growing antiquated.

Not less remarkable than the purely musical is the devotional aspect of the masterpieces of art which have won an undying fame for Handel. He was a great colourist, but his religious principles and promptings stood him in as good stead in the construction of his oratorios as did his genius, learning, and scholarship. Brought up amid the atmosphere of the *chorale*—the simple song of the Protestant Church in Germany—Handel was well equipped for evolving an art-creation—a grand development of the English anthem—that would appeal to the hearts and ears of the English people. This influence is the real secret of Handel's clear and simple style. His naturally serious temperament enabled him to deal with solemn things in a befitting spirit: he knew his Bible well, and in the absence of a librettist could construct his own books. In the case of *Israel in Egypt* it is generally supposed that he did.

Handel's orchestration was not in advance of its day, and to our modern ears necessarily sounds bald and scanty; hence the desirability of the additional accompaniments which Mozart, Mendelssohn, and other musicians have added to the master's oratorios in order to give them the advantage of instrumental support which Handel himself would probably have been the first to use had it been in existence. Among the radical changes marking the close of the eighteenth century, music became affected. Instrumental art began to dispute the field with vocal, and although Handel did not—he necessarily could not—do for orchestration what Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven were able to accomplish, yet he advanced it considerably by his manner of using it. He did not increase the material of instrumentation, but his manipulation of it, his original as well as beautiful utilisation of the instruments, whether in *obbligato* accompaniment or in chorus, carried this phase of musical art far ahead.

Orchestration.

No new musical forms can be credited to Handel, although he considerably advanced existing ones. Carissimi (1604-74), who lived and died before the composer of the *Messiah* was

born, did much for recitative, the double-chorus, and instrumental effect in *Jonah;* yet all is as nothing compared with what the next comer, Handel, accomplished in his colossal choral conceptions. The choruses especially rise grandly over all similar forms of art; and although Haydn, Spohr, Mendelssohn, and lesser masters like Macfarren and Sullivan, have turned to oratorios, one only—Mendelssohn—has approached the grandeur and sublimity of Handel in the chorus. Such examples as the "Amen" and the "Hallelujah" (*Messiah*), "When his loud voice" (*Jephtha*), "Gird on thy sword" (*Saul*), "He spake the word" and "I will sing unto the Lord" (*Israel in Egypt*), with "The many rend the skies" (*Alexander's Feast*), and numerous others, thoroughly represent the master. Their vastness, contrapuntal ingenuity, and descriptive character lift them above all else of their kind, so that whenever the word "chorus" is mentioned musically the mind invariably reverts to Handel. There is not one among the many which he has written that does not contain abundant evidence of theoretical power and skill, and yet there are no insuperable vocal difficulties; on the contrary, the great choral associations throughout the country sing Handel's music better than any other—it being a secret with the master to create the most extraordinary choral effects by the simplest means. This simplicity always ends in sublimity; and ever present as it is in Handel's oratorios, these works become the ideal of sacred musical art—matchless and unsurpassable. On the whole, then, we trace Handel's great service to music, not to this or that invention in form or theory, but to the pure atmosphere which has grown out of the regular performance of his oratorios. His music has raised the whole tone and character of the art, and has so permeated all classes that indifferent or vulgar music now has, happily, a poor prospect of being tolerated.

Method and Influence.

The great musician laboured in every field of music. Thus he was the ready and practical musician, knowing what people could sing, play, and what they liked. He became the teacher of queens, princes, and the nobility, while many a singer of his day benefited by his suggestion and instruction. As an organist he was unrivalled; and his performances, when blind on the instrument at the Foundling Hospital, when

"with all Heaven before his eyes," are historical matters in music. Morally he was as great as he was musically; and his charity and goodness of heart were unbounded. His musical influence it would be impossible to measure, since it is general rather than specific. It is, we repeat, the atmosphere surrounding Handel's music which has proved so beneficial to this country. Musicians and composers do not imitate Handel; he invented no forms and rhythms such as Mendelssohn has set to tempt copyists; he is not a composer who can be "cribbed" from without the certainty of detection. All is above all. It is the lofty sublimity, the simple grandeur, the overpowering truthfulness of every bar that the master has written, which, rising up about us, have become as natural to us as the air we breathe. This influence has educated us as to what good music is and must be to please the English people. This healthy state and musical perception have been brought about mainly by Handel's oratorio music, for which reason the master will ever stand as the great musical educator of our country. The effect of his music has been to make England what it is musically to-day; and, as in gratitude for all this, thousands of people go annually to his resting-place, in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey, to pay silent tribute to the genius who, though dead, still speaks more and more triumphantly.

R. E. PROTHERO. Agriculture, 1689-1742.

THE great changes which English agriculture witnessed in the course of the century following the Revolution may, roughly speaking, be identified with five names—Jethro Tull, Lord Townshend, Bakewell of Dishley, Arthur Young, and Mr. Coke of Holkham. To the efforts of these men were due the changes in farming methods, which alone could have enabled the land of the country to support the struggle of the Napoleonic wars, and to meet the sudden demand for food of a manufacturing population that advanced in numbers by leaps and bounds. Through the improvements which these pioneers initiated, England provided bread and beef for the great centres of commercial industry that sprang up, as if by magic, at the close of the eighteenth century, at a time when it would have been

impossible to obtain supplies from any other country. The history of only two of these founders of modern English farming, Jethro Tull and Townshend, falls within the present period.

The Old System of Cultivation.

But to understand the precise nature of the changes involved by a comparison of the agriculture of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, it is necessary to form a clear notion of the way in which the bulk of the soil was cultivated in 1689, and for nearly a hundred years later.

The Aspect of the Country.

Vast tracts of country, which now are cultivated, then lay waste and unenclosed. Hainault and Epping Forest occupied a great part of the county of Essex; Hounslow Heath and Finchley Common were, as late as 1793, described as wastes fit only for Cherokees and savages; two years earlier the weald of Surrey still bore evidence of its total desolation in the posts which stood across it as "guides to the letter carriers." If such was the condition of the neighbourhood of London at the close of the eighteenth century, it may be supposed that, a hundred years earlier, less civilised districts were yet more barren and uncultivated. Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire were still undrained. Robin Hood would have found his forest of Sherwood still covering the greater part of Nottinghamshire. Derbyshire was a black region of ling, and from the northern point of the county to the extremity of Northumberland—a distance of 150 miles—the traveller would, like Jeanie Deans, encounter nothing but wastes. In 1734 the forest of Knaresborough "was so thick with wood that he was thought a cunning fellow that could readily find out these Spaws" of Harrogate. The road from Beverley to Hull was marked out by willows, which showed above the swamp; at dusk the bells rang from Barton-upon-Humber to guide the traveller; from Sleaford to Brigg the land lighthouse of Dunstan pillar directed wayfarers across a solitary waste.

Rural Life.

Of the cultivated land of England more than three-fifths was tilled on the open-field system—in village farms by associations of agricultural partners. Each of these village farms was practically isolated and self-supporting. Highway rates were unknown, and, except along the main arteries of communication, roads hardly existed. Wheeled carriages were, in country districts, scarcely ever

used. The drift-lanes, more or less impassable, which communicated between the village and the cultivated land, and ceased when the bounds were reached, could only be called roads by an improbable courtesy. The inhabitants had little need of communication with their immediate neighbours, still less with the outside world. The fields and the live-stock provided the necessary food and clothing. Whatever wood might be required for building, fences, or fuel, was provided on the wastes. Each village had its mill, generally the property of the lord of the manor; almost every house had its oven and brewing kettle. Women spun wool into coarse cloth: men tanned their own leather. Wealth only existed in its simplest forms, and natural divisions of employment were not made, because only the rudest implements of production were now used. The rough tools required for the cultivation of the soil, and the rude household utensils needed for the comfort of daily life, were made at home. In the long winter evenings farmers, their sons, and their servants carved the wooden spoons, the platters, and the beechen bowls; fitted and riveted the bottoms into the horn mugs, or closed, in coarse fashion, the holes in the leathern jugs. They plaited the wicker baskets; fitted handles to the scythes, rakes, and other tools; cut the staves, and fixed the thongs for the flails; made the willow or ashen teeth for rakes and harrows, and hardened them in the fire; fashioned ox yokes and forks, racks and rackstaves; twisted willows into scythe cradles, or into the traces and other harness gear. Travelling carpenters, smiths, and tinkers visited farmhouses and remoter villages at rare intervals to perform those parts of the work which needed their professional skill. But every village of any size found employment for such trades as those of the smith and the carpenter. Meanwhile the women plaited the straw for the neck-collars, stitched and stuffed sheepskin bags for the cart saddle, wove the stirrups and halters from hemp or straw, peeled the rushes for and made the candles. Spinning wheels, distaffs, needles were never idle. Coarse, home-made cloth and linen supplied all wants. Every farmhouse and most cottages had their brewing-kettles. The very names of spinster, webster, shepster, litster, brewster, and baxter, show that women span, wove, cut out and dyed cloth, as well as brewed and baked for the household.

The Open-field System.

Round each village lay the land, which the inhabitants cultivated in common on the open-field system, as members of a common household, as partners in a common venture. The average size of a single holding was eighteen acres of arable land, two acres of meadow, and common rights, over the common field and other commonable places, for forty sheep and as many cattle as the holder could fodder in the winter months. But each holding not only varied in size, but was cut up into minute, scattered, intermixed strips. One man might hold his portion of the soil as freehold, another as copyhold, another as a leaseholder for lives, another as a tenant for a certain length of time, from year to year, or at will. But whatever the tenure by which the land was held, the whole was farmed in common upon a system which, originating at a date before the Norman Conquest, in 1689 governed the tillage of, at least, three-fifths of the cultivated soil of the country, and though it gradually disappeared in the last three decades of the eighteenth century and the first half of the present century, yet survived in 1879.

The land of the village farm consisted of meadow, arable land, and pasture. If an open-field farm in Wiltshire be taken as an example, it will be found that in shape it was generally long, narrow, and oblong, hemmed in between the downs and the stream, and often stretching three miles in length. At one end stood the cluster of mud-built, straw-thatched cottages, each with its yard, or small pasture, for horses, calves, or field-oxen. Sometimes these yards, or "garstons," were common to all the village tenants for rearing stock or for the oxen which could not "endure his warke to labour all daye, and then to be put to the commons or before the herdsman." In these enclosures, or "happy garstons," as they were called at Aston Boges, in Oxfordshire, were held the village merrymakings.

The Meadows.

In the lowest part of the land, if possible along the banks of the stream, lay the permanent meadows, or "ings," as they were often called. These meadows were fenced off in strips, and balloted for by the tenants, and held in separate ownership from Candlemas, or from Lady-day, to Midsummer Day, or hay harvest. As soon as the grass was mown and the hay carried, the meadows

once more became open common pasturage, and so remained till they were once more allotted and put up for hay.

The Arable Land.

Beyond the meadows, and running up into the downs till the soil was too poor and steep for the plough, lay the three great tillage fields. Each year one of these bare, hedgeless fields was sown with wheat or rye, or with a mixture of the two, called "maslin"; another was sown with barley, oats, beans, or pease; the third lay fallow. In this unvarying triennial succession the arable land was tilled and cropped. Each of the three fields was cut up into acre or half-acre strips, divided from each other by narrow, rough, bush-grown balks of unploughed turf. The complete holding of each village was so distributed that each man had a third of his holding in each of the three fields, and the three bundles of strips did not lie contiguously, but were so separated and intermixed that the good and the bad land was evenly distributed. Thus, suppose John Doe to hold eighteen acres of arable land, he would each year have six acres under wheat and rye, six acres under barley, oats, beans, or pease, and six acres fallow; and each of the bundle of strips would be so scattered that the tenant received his due proportion of the best and the worst soil. From seed-time to harvest the strips were fenced off for the benefit of the individual to whom they belonged. After the crops were cleared, the fences were removed, common rights revived, and the cattle of the village wandered promiscuously over the whole.

The Waste.

Beyond the meadows and the tillage lay the poorest and roughest land, which was left uncleared, affording in its native wildness mast and acorns for the swine, rough pasture for the ordinary stock, timber for building, fencing, and fuel; rushes, reeds, and heather for thatches, ropes, baskets, beds, candles, and a variety of other uses in the farm or the house. In these directions also lay the cow-downs and the sheep pastures. The herdsman and the shepherd were employed by the villagers to take care of their flock and herd. The rams and bulls were the property of the parish. Sheep were valued more for their wool than their mutton, and cows were chiefly kept for milk, breeding, or draught purposes. The common shepherd drives the sheep of the commoners to the downs,

or folds them in the common fold upon the arable land, or, when they require to be fed, pens and feeds them in separate lots, each commoner supplying the food for his flock. On the cow-downs the common herdsman tends the cattle of the community. They begin to feed there in May, and continue to graze the downs till after the hay-harvest and after the arable fields are cleared of their crops. In the height of summer they feed in the small marshes by the river, or along the sides of the lanes, or tethered on the turf balks, and are only driven to the cow-downs after the evening milking. In the late summer they are turned in upon the aftermath of the hay-meadows, the haulm of the beans and pease, the stubble of the wheat, rye, oats, and barley. No winter keep was known to the open-field farmer. He turned a deaf ear, as has been said, to the suggestions of book-agriculturists. Consequently, it was only at the wane of the summer that his cattle were more than skin and bone. From Michaelmas onwards they steadily declined in condition, and only survived the winter in a state of semi-starvation. The roast beef of old England, for the enormous majority of the population, consisted of the worn-out oxen or the aged cows that were slaughtered in the autumn, when at their fattest, and salted for winter consumption. "For Easter at Martylmas hang up a beef" is the advice of Tusser.

The Economic Defects of the System.

Such was the system in which the greater part of the cultivated land of the country was tilled in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The defects of it are sufficiently obvious. Unless the whole body of farmers agreed together, no individual could move hand or foot. It would be financial ruin for any member of the community to grow turnips or clover for the benefit of his neighbours. No winter crops could be grown so long as the arable fields were subjected to common rights of pasture. The land was wasted in innumerable footpaths and balks. The strips were too narrow to admit of cross-harrowing or cross-ploughing. Farmers spent their whole day in visiting the different parcels of which their holdings were composed, and their expenses in reaping and carting were immensely increased by the remoteness of the different strips. Drainage was impossible, for if one man drained his land or scoured his courses, his neigh-

bour blocked his outfalls. Consequently, the arable land was rarely cleaned: it was choked with docks and thistles, overrun with nettles and rushes, pitted with wet places, pimpled with ant-hills and mole-heaps. Litigation was perpetual when it was so easy for men to plough up the common balks or headlands, remove their neighbours' landmarks, or poach their land by a turn of the plough, or filch their crops when reaping. As long ago as Piers Plowman there had been complaints against reapers reaping their neighbours' ground, and in Robert de Brunne's "Handlyng Sinne" there is a reference to the false "husbands" that "ere aweye falsely mennys landys." The manure of the live stock of the village was wasted by the immense area over which the animals travelled. The promiscuous herding of the sheep and cattle generated every sort of infectious disorder. The scab was rarely absent from the common-fold, or the rot from the ill-drained field. No individual owner could improve his own live-stock when all the half-starved, diseased cattle and sheep of the village were crowded together on the same commons. Moreover, from the productive point of view, the wastes and commons were a standing reproach to the rural economy of the country, and were capable of being turned to more profitable account in the hands of enterprising individuals than under the common control of a large body of ignorant, prejudiced, and suspicious co-partners.

Agriculture in Scotland.

The general description which has been given applies to almost every part of the country. Scotland formed no exception to the rule. Scottish farmers, who are now reckoned among the most skilful, were, in 1689, inferior to those of England, and their methods of raising crops had remained unchanged since the Battle of Bannockburn. Alexander Garden, of Troup, describes the system which was followed in 1686. The land was divided into in-field and out-field. The in-field was kept "constantly under corne and bear, the husbandman dunging it every thrie years, and, for his pains, if he reap the fourth corne he is satisfied." The out-field was allowed to grow green with weeds and thistles, and, after four or five years of this repose, was twice ploughed and sown with corn. Three crops were taken in succession, and then, when the soil was too exhausted to repay seed and labour, reverted to its thistles

and weeds. Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk in Aberdeenshire says that, in 1716, turnips grown in fields by the Earl of Rothes and a few others were objects of wonder, that except in East Lothian no wheat was grown, that there were few enclosures, no repaired roads, few wheel-carriages. On his paternal estate

"there was not one acre enclosed, nor any timber upon it, but a few elm, sycamore, and ash about a small kitchen-garden adjoining the house, and some struggling trees at some of the farm-yards, with a small copse-wood, not enclosed, and dwarfish, and browsed by sheep and cattle. All the farms ill-disposed and mixed; different persons having alternate ridges; not one wheel-carriage on the estate, nor indeed any one road that would allow it. The whole land raised and uneven, and full of stones, many of them very large, of a hard iron quality, and all the ridges crooked in shape of a S, and very high and full of noxious weeds, and poor, being worn out by culture without proper manure or tillage. The people poor, ignorant, and slothful, and ingrained enemies to planting, enclosing, or any improvement or cleanness."

The Beginning of Reform.

The state of agriculture revealed in this passage is as bad or worse than that of England. But in both countries improvements were at hand, and from the same sources. Donaldson, whose "Husbandry Anatomised" (1697) is, as has been said, the first Scottish work on agriculture, did not indeed expect that the improvements which he recommended would be taken up by tenants. People will, he says, probably answer him with "Away with your fool Notions; there are too many Bees in your Bonet-case; we will satisfie ourselves with such Measures as our Fathers have followed hitherto." Both in Scotland and in England it was, in fact, idle to expect that the open-field farmers, or the rack-rented tenantry, or even the leaseholder for lives, would initiate changes in the cultivation of the soil. Nor would the small freeholders or the yeomen be likely to attempt alterations in the agricultural methods of their forefathers which, in a single season, might bring them to the verge of ruin. It was in both countries the large landlord who took the lead in the agricultural revolution of the eighteenth century. But towards the close of the period, the new markets created by the sudden development of manufacturing industries convinced every sensible farmer that the shortest road to wealth was to turn the primitive self-

The Agricultural Revolution.

sufficing farms into manufactories of bread and beef. Under the pressure of necessity, enclosures (both of uncultivated land and of open-field farms), reclamation of wastes, partition of commons, large farms, long leases, capitalist landlords and farmers, and scientific husbandry convulsed rural society, and absolutely revolutionised its general aspect. The extinction of the commoner, the small freeholder, the small farmer, and even the yeoman was the price which the nation paid for food for its manufacturing population.

The Writings of Jethro Tull.

The part which Jethro Tull played in this great change was rather theoretical than practical. But the principles which he laid down in his "Horse-Hoeing Husbandry" (1733) were the principles on which the agricultural revolution was based. He was the "greatest individual improver" that British agriculture ever knew, and by his determination, enterprise, sagacity, observation, and inventive faculty anticipated most of the results of modern scientific farming. Born in 1674, he matriculated at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1691, and studied the law in London. In 1693 he made the grand tour of Europe, everywhere noting the methods, products, and implements of foreign agriculture. In 1699 he married, and settled down on a farm near Wallingford, which he inherited from his father. This he subsequently sold, and the bulk of his valuable experiments were carried out at Mount Prosperous, in Berkshire, where he died in 1740. Here he experimented in the depth of soil with which seed should be covered, was careful in selecting, cleaning, and changing his seed, and invented a drill which deposited the seed in furrows instead of scattering it broadcast by hand. Studying the growth of plant life, he discovered that the more the soil is worked and stirred the more freely do the roots obtain the organic elements of vegetation. On this principle he drilled his wheat and turnips in ridges, with wide spaces between, which he horse-hoed, stirred, and pulverised in order to extend the food range of his growing crops.

The Landlords as Reformers.

On his own land Tull's experiments were successful. But on the old open-field farmer, who knew nothing of the value of the choice, and selection, and cleansing of seed, and who sowed broadcast at varying depths, they were entirely lost.

Equally fruitless, so far as his immediate neighbours were concerned, was his demonstration of the advantages of turnips, and of the drilling and horse-hoeing of roots and wheats. It was not till Tull's principles were put in practice by large landlords that their full results were illustrated. This was the work of men like Lord Townshend in Norfolk, Lord Ducie, Lord Halifax, or the members of the Scottish Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture, under the leadership of Lord Cathcart and Mr. Hope of Rankeilor. But the inventive genius of Tull, and his discovery of the true principles of a practical and rational agriculture, give him a conspicuous place among the pioneers of British farming.

Charles, second Viscount Townshend, may be taken as a type of the reforming landlords who now assumed the lead in agricultural improvement. Born in 1676, he died in 1738, having succeeded to the title and estates of his father when a child of ten years old. As a politician he played a prominent part in the history of the country at a critical period (p. 2). Lord Privy Seal under William III., he served as a Commissioner to treat for the union of England and Scotland, and, as a joint plenipotentiary with Marlborough, signed the Peace of Gertruydenberg in 1709. In the same year as Ambassador at the Hague, he negotiated the famous Barrier Treaty. Under George I. and George II. he acted as Secretary of State, as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and, as joint Secretary of State with Walpole, directed the foreign policy of the country.

In 1730 Lord Townshend retired from political life to Rainham, in Norfolk. There he devoted himself to the care of his estates, experimenting in the farming practices which he had observed abroad, and devoting himself, above all, to the field cultivation of turnips and improvements in the rotation of crops. He reintroduced the ancient, but almost obsolete, practice of marling the light lands of Norfolk; he encouraged and advocated enclosures; and, following the lines laid down by Jethro Tull, drilled and horse-hoed his turnips instead of sowing them broadcast. He was an exponent of the maxim that "The more the irons are among the roots, till the leaves spread across the rows, the better." He was also the initiator of the Norfolk, or four-course, system of cropping, in which turnips, grasses, and cereals were judiciously alternated. The introduction of green crops saved the farmer from the

necessity of leaving a portion of his holding in unproductive fallow, and taught him to observe what, in the absence of chemical manures, was the golden rule of never taking two corn crops in succession from the land. The winter-keep, thus provided, enabled him to carry more stock, and gave him more manure, enriched the soil, trebled the yield, and verified the proverbial saying that "A full bullock-yard and a full fold makes a full granary."

So zealous was Townshend's advocacy of roots as the pivot of agricultural improvement, that he gained the nickname of "Turnip" Townshend, and supplied Pope with an example for his Horatian Illustrations—

> "Why, of two brothers, rich and restless, one
> Ploughs, burns, manures, and toils from sun to sun;
> The other slights, for women, sports and wines,
> All Townshend's turnips and all Grosvenor's mines,
> Is known alone to that Divining Power
> Who forms the genius in the natal hour."

Townshend's efforts to improve his estate were richly rewarded. On the light sandy soil of Norfolk his methods of farming were peculiarly successful. The furze-capped warrens, where "two rabbits fought for every blade of grass," were in a few years converted into tracts of well-cultivated and productive land. Landlords and farmers who adopted his system realised fortunes. In thirty years, one farm rose in value from £180 a year to £800; another, rented by a warrener at £18 a year, was let to a farmer at £240; a farmer named Mallet made enough off a holding of 1,500 acres to buy an estate of the annual value of £1,800. Young, writing in 1760, thus describes the effect of Townshend's husbandry on a district near Norwich—

> "Thirty years ago it was an extensive heath without either tree or shrub, only a sheep-walk to another farm. Such a number of carriages crossed it, that they would sometimes be a mile abreast in pursuit of the best tract. Now there is an excellent turnpike road, enclosed on each side with a good quick-set hedge, and the whole laid out in enclosures and cultivated in the Norfolk system in superior style. The whole is let at 15s. an acre, ten times the original value."

TRADE jealousies had always been strongly marked in England, but throughout the first half of the eighteenth century they became more prominent than ever; the wars of William and Anne had been costly, and by the new financial expedient of a national debt (IV., p. 522) payment was spread indefinitely over the future, instead of being made at the time. Consequently, there was a general increase of taxation. Ministers had to raise money somewhere; and while artisans were so little able to make themselves felt in Parliament, trades were naturally often chosen to pay. The effect of this was twofold: trades became increasingly jealous one of another, and increasingly political; and secondly, trade writings and figures became more and more partisan and untrustworthy. To us who are accustomed to regard statistics as more or less identical with facts, there is something strange in the idea that it is as vain to expect accuracy and impartiality in a trade pamphlet of 1715 as in the political leader of a newspaper of to-day. Each is written in a partisan spirit, in order to make out the best case possible for the side. Official statistics of the time were trustworthy enough, but almost all others were collected with a purpose, and must be discounted. Trades defended themselves from taxation variously. One method was to make themselves out as large as possible; to put out an extravagant estimate of men employed, all of whom had large families, dependent on the trade for a livelihood; to say the menaced trade was the second in the kingdom; to urge that the materials used already paid duty, and make a touching appeal on the ground of the widespread ruin that would follow a tax. Another was to say the trade was small and young, a delicate child, struggling hard against foreign competition; that the return from the tax would be very small, and the expense of collecting it so great that all profit would be swallowed up. Was it, then, worth while to ruin a trade for so little? On one thing the trades were touchingly unanimous, each saying that some one else was a more proper subject for taxation than itself. For example, the glassmen said they lost much by breakage, but why not tax coal? The coal-

G. TOWNSEND WARNER. Manufacture.

Trade Jealousy.

The Contemporary Statistics.

owners drew a harrowing picture of an empty hearth, but why not tax linen? The linen men, principally Scots, appealed to the Act of Union on their own behalf, but a tax on alehouses seemed to them highly desirable. This brought the publicans and brewers up in arms, and so the game went on—wool, silk, calico, earthenware, iron, land, all arguing for their different interests and blind to the good of the public. Nowhere is the difficulty of a Protective system more clearly shown.

Thus trades were in reality much more prosperous than they wished to appear. In particular, the silk industry was doing well. Silk weaving was well established, and by the enterprise of Sir Thomas Lombe silk spinning was introduced from Italy. Sir Thomas was the son of a Norwich weaver, but he moved to London and was admitted a member of the Mercers' Company in 1707. Struck by the fact that organzine or silk thread had to be imported from Italy, he persuaded his half-brother John to go there and learn the secrets of the trade. The story is that John's journey was full of adventure; the jealousy of the Italian craftsmen compelled disguise and strict secrecy. John, in fact, was a spy in an enemy's country. He was successful in his task, and returned to England bringing some Italian workmen and drawings of the machinery used. With regard to the latter, it seems that John's trouble was superfluous, for a very complete description of this machinery had been published by V. Zonca in 1607 and 1621; while in 1692 some persons had petitioned, unsuccessfully, to be incorporated into an English silk winding company. But the workmen were probably the real treasure. In 1718 Sir Thomas obtained a patent for three engines—one to wind the finest raw silk, another to spin, and another to twist into organzine. In 1719 this machinery was set up at Derby on an island in the Derwent, and the business developed rapidly, in spite of John Lombe's death in 1722. By a writer of a later date the sad event was attributed to a slow poison given by some enraged Italian workmen who came to England for the purpose. This story, though picturesque, is untrue. In 1732 Sir Thomas' patent ran out, and he applied to Parliament for an extension, on the ground that he had been put to

The Silk Trade.

Silk Spinning.

The Lombes.

great expense in training workmen, and that the Sardinian Government had, in revenge, prohibited the export of raw silk. It was also shown that by his enterprise silk-thread was 5s. per lb. cheaper, and England was becoming independent of Italian organzine. His application was opposed by petitions of the mohair, cotton, thread and worsted spinners of Manchester, Macclesfield, Leek, Blackburn and Stockport, who wished to apply his machinery to their own trades, and also by the Corporation of Derby, on the curious ground that his invention decreased the wool trade, and that although it employed the poor it kept them at home, and eventually threw them on the rates. Finally the extension was refused, but £14,000 was voted to Lombe for a compensation.

Raw Silk.

Less fortune attended the attempt to produce raw silk in England. In 1718 a patent was granted to John Apletre to manage and produce raw silk of the growth of England. His prospectus asking for a capital of £1,000,000 argues in favour of home produce, points out that young ladies often keep silkworms for pleasure, and that it was easy enough to grow mulberry trees. This was all true enough, but the projector did not reckon with the climate. A plantation of silkworms was made in Chelsea Walled Park, and the apparatus included an evaporating stove, and "a certain Engine called the Egg Cheste"; but the whole scheme naturally ended in failure. England, as before, got silk from abroad, the annual import being, in round numbers, 2,500 bales brought by the Turkey Company, 1,300 from Italy, and 850 from India, each bale weighing 160 lbs.

Woollens.

The woollen trade easily maintained the first place among English industries. Its progress was steady rather than striking, and it was watchful against new trades that might harm it. Thus the weavers opposed Lombe: they opposed English linens because these ousted German linens, and so Germany would have nothing to offer in exchange for English woollen goods: they strongly supported the bill of 1720 directed against printed calicoes (p. 140): they complained that wool was run or smuggled out of England, whereby the price of the raw material was enhanced, and foreign weavers robbed English weavers of part of their work. Government treated the trade kindly. Laws were made strict against running; dyes for the wool could be imported

free of duty; the growth of madder in England was encouraged, and the duty was taken off Irish wool. Haynes calculated that to make up a pack of wool (240 lbs.) into fine stuffs, serges, and callimancoes, would employ for one week 302 persons—viz. 7 combers earning £3 10s., 250 spinners earning £18, 20 throwers and doublers earning £5, and 25 weavers earning £12. This table brings out a fact which became of increasing importance—the excessive labour spent on hand spinning; ten spinners were required to keep up with one weaver, and the rate of wages was very low. But then spinning was a bye-industry largely practised in agricultural districts by women in the evening after their day's work was over. In fact, the difficulty of getting yarns was the main hindrance to rapid progress in woollen industries. Between 1718 and 1724 the average export of woollen goods was £2,962,881; between 1738 and 1742, £3,500,619.

Hand Spinning.

Of the other textile industries linen was progressing steadily. Scotland and Ireland continued to be the chief homes of the business, but in 1740 the English industry was said to be little inferior to the Scotch. In 1731 England imported 3,891,573 yards from Scotland, and from Ireland 4,081,394 yards; in 1739, from Scotland 4,801,537 yards, and from Ireland 6,590,084. This seems to show that the Irish industry was growing the faster of the two. There was a continued jealousy felt of the Scotch, who in their turn complained that their trade was much injured by chequered and striped linen made in Spitalfields. All the linen makers were alarmed by the Bill of 1720, but the blow fell on the calico trade alone. Dyed and printed calicoes were forbidden, and wearers of suspicious materials arrested and, if need be, punished. After 1736, colour printing, however, was allowed in linen goods and cotton goods made with a linen warp. Of minor industries, lace-making claimed, when resenting a proposed tax, to be the second trade of the kingdom, but its importance was much overrated. It was, however, widely spread and largely practised as a bye-industry. The framework knitting was centring more and more round Nottingham and Leicester. In 1727 there were 2,500 frames round London, and 5,500 in

Linen.

Lace.

Framework Knitting.

the provinces. In 1730 the first cotton stockings were made, and in 1740 the sliding tuck-presser was invented. English stockings were in request on the Continent. The trade was much engaged in quarrels at home, some masters taking too many apprentices, and thus giving no opening for journeymen. Two London masters kept respectively twenty-three and forty-nine apprentices. The Company of Framework Knitters tried repeatedly to reform these abuses, but without success. Gold and silver thread employed considerable numbers in London. At the beginning of the reign of George I. the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, contained eighty-five sheds for spinning gold and silver thread; 1,275 parish boys and girls were employed; there were 118 master wiredrawers, 106 master weavers of gold and silver lace fringes, besides a great number of silver and gold bone lace makers, button makers, windsters and flatters of gold and silver, and engine spinners, but the wages paid were very low.

Gold and Silver Thread.

The most noticeable advance in the hardware trades falls so late in this period that its effect was hardly felt. In 1742, Thomas Bolsover, of Sheffield, who was repairing the handle of a knife, part silver and part copper, was struck with the idea of making plated goods. He confined himself to small articles, such as buttons and snuff-boxes; but another cutler of the same town, Joseph Hancock, applied the idea to candlesticks, teapots, and other things: but the development of this branch of the trade in Sheffield and Birmingham belongs properly to the next period. As copper and brass could be worked with coal, they were free from the difficulty which beset the iron trade, namely, want of fuel. Wood, in 1720, had good copper and lead mines, and the best conveniences for making brass, ingots, battery kettles, hammered plates, and wire: a number of persons were employed in raising copper ore in Devon and Cornwall, and the manufacture of brass was said to employ 6,500 families.

Hardware Plate.

Copper and Brass.

The iron trade was almost stationary. Fuel was getting more scarce and more expensive: the output of English pig iron was not enough to supply our wants. It was frequently desired to admit

Iron.

American pig iron, but English ironmasters strongly opposed this. By an Act of 1719 the iron manufacture in America was practically suppressed. Swedish pig iron was imported, as it was found to be best for making steel. From 1711-18 the import of iron was 15,642 tons; from 1729-35, 25,501 tons, while the exports for the same periods were 4,365 and 5,334 tons respectively. In 1740 there were only fifty-nine furnaces in England with an output of 17,350 tons, an average of 294 tons each; the chief output was from Cheshire, Gloucestershire, Hereford, Salop, Worcestershire, Sussex and Yorkshire. Sussex had the most furnaces—ten—but the output was lowest, averaging only 140 tons; in Cheshire there were three furnaces, but they were in full work, and turned out 570 tons each. As wood became more dear, the ironmasters turned anxiously to coal, that is in the shape of coke, for raw coal seemed hopeless. Indeed, when writers of the time speak of smelting with "pit-coal," coke is meant.

Smelting with Coal: Abraham Darby.

Dudley, whose attempts have already been mentioned, almost certainly used coke, and not raw coal. Abraham Darby, of Coalbrookdale, used coke for his furnaces. He was also the first to get a satisfactory way of casting iron. He and a boy in his employment were watching some attempts in this direction made by Dutch founders, when the boy said he thought he saw where the others failed. Darby and he tried his idea, and Darby patented in 1708 a new way of casting iron in sand without loam or clay. What the improvement was it is difficult to say: whether it was the use of sand alone, or the making of better air-holes. In any case, the plan remained for a long time a trade secret at Coalbrookdale. Abraham Darby the elder died in 1717, and his son and namesake took up the management of the works in 1730. He is sometimes said to have discovered the use of coke for smelting; but it is certain that coke had been used by his father. The son used it extensively, however, and made a practical success of it. But the maximum of noise with the minimum of result came from William Wood (p. 169). Besides the copper and brass business mentioned above, this person in 1720 had a lease of all the mines on Crown lands for thirty-nine counties: he boasted that he had the best ironworks, forges for refining

William Wood.

and drawing iron out into bars, a slitting mill and furnaces for making pig iron, rails, banisters, backs and hearths for chimneys, etc. He also proposed to lease vacant land and grow cordwood thereon for fuel. Fuel must have run scarce, however, for in 1726 Wood was at Whitehaven talking of 100 furnaces worked with coal, and proposing to make incredible quantities of iron. He contracted to deliver 10,000 tons per annum to the Mines Royal Company at £11 and £12 the ton. In 1729 eleven furnaces were set up, but all the iron made was worthless. Eventually ten tons were consigned to the Company, but they would permit no trial to be made of its quality. Several trials were made at Frisington by experts, with the result that the iron was proved to break on the second or third heating. Wood did produce about six tons of good iron, but this was made at Russell's wood charcoal forge. A derisive person issued a prospectus purporting to come from Wood, saying that the operators had met with infidels at Frisington, and were now coming to London to exhibit his inventions. The public were invited to witness Wood's excellent method of pulverising iron ore and mixing it with coal, and making the result into bar iron which breaks at the first heating, and to subscribe £1,000,000 for shares; forty per cent. would be given for prompt payment, and "Mr. Wood's Irish halfpence taken, but no discount would be given on them." The difficulty in using coal was the more to be regretted, as the output of coal was increasing and the price falling. It was more used in houses, and in brick and tile, glass, lime, copper and brass works.

Glass.

Considerable activity was also shown in glass. The trade had much resented a tax in William III.'s reign, but it does not appear to have suffered. Bottles, flint glass, crown glass, plate and coach glass, window glass, and glass for the table, was all made in considerable quantity. One firm of glass makers were said to have 20,000 dozen bottles in hand. The ordinary price of bottles was 3s. per dozen quarts, and 2s. 6d. for pints. There were over sixty glass houses in England. If we may judge by Haudicquer de Blancourt's book on glass, translated from the French in 1699, a fairly wide knowledge was accessible, for the book, besides describing in full all ordinary glass work, gives in-

structions for making coloured glass with zaffer, manganese ferrelto, crocus martis, crocus veneris, and all sorts of colours —gold, yellow, garnet, amethyst, sapphire, velvet black, milk white, marble, peach colour, deep red, pearl colour, viper, ruby, topaz, opal, and sunflower.

The china and earthenware trades were chiefly carried on around Burslem, though the Chelsea works, with its beautiful china, and the "New Canton" factory at Bow, began to work during this period. At Burslem, Thomas and Ralph Toft turned out some fine plates, which generally bear the maker's name. In 1720 Astbury began the use of flint; in 1724 Redrich and Jones brought out a new method for staining, veining, spotting, clouding, damasking, and imitating porphyry. Benson made an improved machine for grinding flints in water by iron wheels, and thus saving all dust; and in 1733 Shaw obtained a patent for employing various sorts of minerals, earth, clay, and other earthy substances, "to make up a fine body whose outside will be of a fine chocolate colour striped with white and the inside of white." By his peculiar ware Shaw made much money, but he ruined himself by jealousy of other potters, for, in bringing an action to protect himself, it came out that his secret was to wash the inside of the cup, and make lines on the outside with a thick slip of flint and pipeclay. The essential thing was the use of flint, Astbury's old discovery, and so the judge held that Shaw's patent was void. He gave the case against him, and, to the general joy of the trade, dismissed them with the words, "Go home, potters, and make what pots you please." Coarse earthenware, drainpipes, tiles, and the old butter pots, were also made in quantities, but there is no other novelty to be remarked.

Ceramics.

THE history of England in the eighteenth century is, in great degree, a commercial and economic history. The Spanish Succession War ended in a commercial treaty. The Seven Years' War, which created the expansion of England, has been rightly called a commercial war. The Napoleonic war itself was at bottom a commercial struggle. What is broadly true of the whole century applies still more exactly to the years of

A. L. SMITH. Finance.

peace, 1713-39. The social history of those years might be described as the rivalry and gradual reconciliation between the old "landed men" and the new "monied men." In religious history the practical toleration of Dissenters from 1727 represents their rise to wealth. Even in literary history the same fact is seen. Pegasus is found harnessed to the car of commerce. Swift and Defoe and Addison did some of their most effective writing on subjects of currency, loans, and credit. In politics, the Whig rule was a rule of capitalists. The great events of the period are the firm hold acquired by the Bank and the new East India Company, the convulsion of the South Sea scheme, the sharp lessons on credit taught by the Bubble Companies, the reform of the tariff, the settlement of the National Debt, the foundation of the sinking fund. Even the outburst of war which began to break up the period in 1739 would have been impossible but for the merchants being now eager to wrest from Spain by force what they had as yet filched under protest; it was to be, in the words of Burke, "a war of plunder."

Thus the period saw the birth of modern England, the England of manufactures, of world-wide trade, of commercial legislation, of vast funded systems, of great Joint Stock Companies.

It was, moreover, a seed-time of economic doctrine. Men began to look round them to see from what sources revenue could be drawn, and what were the conditions of national prosperity from which those sources flowed. They began critically to compare the fiscal arrangements of England with those of France, Holland, Spain. They realised that the power of raising loans made the old policy of hoarding treasure obsolete. They were feeling their way along several different lines to a policy of free trade. They became conscious of the primary need of statistics. They learned that the public good could only be reached by the harmony of private aims. When writers had reached this point, the mercantile theory was practically dead, the field was open for Adam Smith and the true doctrine of national wealth.

At this critical juncture the helm of State fell into the hands of a man who with most of the robust vices had also many of the robust virtues of a self-trained, business-like

English squire of the time. Walpole, after all that has been said against him, remains one of our few great finance ministers. He is the first of a roll which closes with the names of Huskisson, Peel, and Gladstone. He had all the penetration, all the broad view, and all the resourcefulness of the born man of business. He saw in matters of taxation just where the shoe pinched. He saw what the commerce of the day needed to open out its vast future. He could make gold out of nothing, it was said. It was he who guided the country through the worst panic it has ever known, who set the public debts on a sound footing, who initiated fiscal reform, who reconciled warring classes by reconciling their interests, who secured the new dynasty by identifying it with national prosperity. All this was a great work. It is true he despised literature, he dreaded religious movements, he shunned foreign affairs; he was coarse, he was domineering, he was a corrupter of politics; but to call him "an unidea'd statesman" is to forget the great work which he did, and the still greater work which he would fain have done.

The Fiscal System.

The English fiscal system under the first Georges has an even better right than the English legal system of Cromwell's time to be described as an ungodly jumble. The revenue consisted of customs and excise, land-tax, window-tax, stamps. These all represented rival principles of taxation, and invited a ceaseless warfare between classes, the landed and the monied interests, the merchants and the retailers, traders and consumers. Between customs and excise there should have been a line of clear-cut principle; there was instead a mere chaos. The old subsidy, the new subsidy, the impost, the additional impost, the new duties, the special duties, each with its own fractional rate, some dating back to 1660, constituted a labyrinth to be threaded only by experts; and the experts had their price, like the patriots. The appropriation of these duties, each to pay off some separate debt, was no less complicated and lucrative. The Customs Acts might have been described as Acts for the suppression of colonial timber, furs, sugar, and fisheries; for the extinction of the English manufacture of hats, silks, and paper; for the extension of adulteration in the necessaries of life; for the promotion of

the honourable profession of smuggler; and for the general advancement of frauds, abuses, and riots among all ranks of his Majesty's subjects.

About one-fifth of the revenue came from the land-tax. But the land-tax was assessed with ridiculous unfairness, and was regarded by landowners as a flagrant violation of good faith. The window-tax was a failure, as regards the amount raised by it; but a notable success, were its object to condemn a growing population to insufficient air and light.

As to the expenditure, about one-half of it was swallowed up by annual charges of the debt. For the nation had just learned the dangerous luxury of borrowing, but had not learned how to apply sound principles to the loans and their repayment.

Walpole's Reforms.

Finally, in the way of any reforms stood not only the populace with their invincible prejudices, but, worse still, the legion of economic false prophets. Nevertheless, a large measure of reform was effected. It has been truly said that Walpole found our tariff the worst in the world, and he left it the best. His great Excise Scheme of 1733 had the way prepared by a long series of judicious measures. Timber was one of the "enumerated articles" of colonial produce secured to us by the Navigation Acts; but heavy duties checked its importation from the colonies. These duties Walpole repealed. He laid down the maxim, obvious but hitherto neglected, that the more prosperous the colonies were the greater would be their demand for English goods. In this spirit he allowed, in 1730, Carolina and Georgia to export their rice into Europe by English ships; and they soon won supremacy in the European markets. The same concession was granted in 1740 to the West Indies for their sugar, and to the northern whale and seal fisheries. The rapid growth of the colonies under such a liberal policy was afterwards demonstrated by Burke. French refugees had established successful silk manufactures in Spitalfields; but they were hampered by heavy duties on the importation of raw silk, till Walpole countervailed these by allowing a drawback on the export of manufactured silk. Pepper, now becoming an article of common use, was still taxed at 2s. 6d. a pound, and that in seven separate sums payable under as many separate Acts.

He reduced it to 4d. a pound, and dealt similarly with cloves and other spices. It was noticed what a stop this put to adulteration and to smuggling, both of which revived in all their vigour when Pitt raised the tax again to 2s. Similar reductions were made for indigo, drugs, beaver skins, and all materials used for paper. When the salt-tax was repealed, even hostile critics admitted the boon thus conferred on all the poor, and the expansion consequent in the glass and leather manufactures and in the fisheries. The general rule in these and kindred reforms may be summed up as a policy of relieving the burdens on food and the necessaries of life, removing those on English manufactured goods, and encouraging the import of raw materials used in these manufactures. By 1721 he had thus set free 106 articles of export and 38 of import. But for the fact that Pitt and the Great War came between Sir Robert Walpole and Sir Robert Peel, there would have been little for the latter to do. Another timely reform was abolishing the valuation of imports by sworn evidence taken from the merchant, for custom-house oaths had become a proverb. These, like the other articles, were now included in official books of rates. In many other ways the whole system was simplified and made uniform.

The Excise Bill.

Walpole's Excise becomes still more important when it is thus seen in its proper light, as the sum and culmination of a whole fiscal policy. It is too often regarded as a mere sop to a political Cerberus, the Jacobite High-Church landowning class. It was, indeed, to have been the means of lowering the land-tax on that class. But for lowering the land-tax there was plenty of independent justification.

The Land-tax.

From 1717 to 1721 the land-tax stood at 3s. in the £; in 1722 it was lowered to 2s.; with the war-scare in 1727 it shot up to 4s., and still stood at 3s. in 1728 and 1729; but in 1730 the rate was 2s., and in 1731 only 1s. To enable him to continue it at this rate, he even retraced the step taken in 1730, and in 1732 re-imposed a duty on salt.

The land-tax had been severely criticised from its very institution. Davenant had estimated that "usurers, lawyers, tradesmen, and retailers" held two-thirds of the wealth of

the country; land and foreign trade represented the remaining one-third, but bore nearly all the taxation. "The landed men complained that ever since the Revolution they had borne the burden and heat of the day." The tax, it was said, pressed hard on all gentry under £1,000 a year; Walpole himself declared, "it has ruined and undone many." What was keenly felt as a grievance was that, having been originally imposed as a land and property tax, it had very soon lost all pretence of reaching personal property; fundholders and merchants, professional men and shopkeepers escaped, as well as yeomen and small farmers, artisans and labourers. This was simply because it proved as impossible to make the assessment a reality as it had proved in the days of the Tudor and Stuart subsidy. The assessors at first received instructions, almost pathetic in their urgency, to make true and actual valuation on incomes and goods, as well as land, without following ancient rating-books. But, in fact, the assessment of 1692 became stereotyped as the model, and in 1697 this practice was accepted; the incomes and goods were somehow heard of no more. It was no use putting the assessors on oath; "for in matters of revenue it has always been found that oaths were very little regarded." So the tax came to mean an exact sum of £494,671, so much and no more, for every shilling levied per pound; while it was paid from land, and land alone. This was not the sole grievance. For when relative wealth as between town and country, and between shires and parishes, came to vary, the land-tax became more and more capriciously unequal; it was "as impolitic and unreasonable a method of raising great sums of money as was ever introduced in any nation" (Halifax). Hence already Davenant had written to urge that the excise should be increased instead, and that by levying it on bulky articles the need should be avoided of searching private houses. Walpole therefore was aiming at a genuine reform when he proposed to keep the land-tax at 1s., and meet the deficit by turning customs duties into duties of excise. His plan would, he estimated, effect at once a saving of £350,000 a year, would check adulteration, and be a death-blow to smuggling, and would increase the annual Civil List by £60,000. The method had been applied to silks as early

Walpole's Plan of Reform.

as 1700, then extended to pepper, and to tea and coffee in 1723, all with marked success. It was simply the modern method of bonded warehouses. His first Bill was to apply to tobacco, on which Sir John Cope's Committee had lately reported to the House. The report had made a startling revelation of the fraud, corruption, perjury, and intimidation that were rampant. The trade had become a happy hunting ground of commercial roguery. Imported tobacco was found to be underweighed by 20 per cent.; exported tobacco overweighed by as much. The officials were in the pay of the merchants, and kept double sets of weights and double sets of papers. It was a common form of agreement that the official should receive one-third of all the duty which he succeeded in filching from the State and in saving the trader. Drawbacks were being paid on "offal" got up to look like tobacco, on hogsheads weighted with bars of lead. One man had thus gained £550 in one shipment. In the last nine years there had been 2,000 prosecutions for these malpractices, and 209 boats had been seized; 250 officers had been violently assaulted, and 6 murdered. False witnesses were kept in readiness, ten or twelve at a time, to swear to whatever was wanted of them, and water-side ruffians in armed gangs of fifty at a time to do the rougher work. It had become as intolerable a tyranny over the colonial planter as it was a monstrous fraud upon the revenue. The whole system of discounts, allowances, and drawbacks fostered a mass of time-honoured abuses and extortions. All these evils would be swept away by the simple expedient of imposing only a small customs duty, $\frac{3}{4}$d. a pound, upon the tobacco as imported; and exacting the full tax ($4\frac{3}{4}$d.) as an excise duty only when the tobacco was actually sold to the retailer and delivered out of the warehouse. Simple, excellent, even obvious, as the measure was, it had two fatal defects. It bore the name of an Excise Bill, whereas the previous reforms discreetly called themselves only Customs Acts, and it was introduced by a minister who was surrounded by a pack of hungry rivals and of intriguing colleagues. The excise was loathed as a foreign mode of taxation. It was ineffaceably stamped with hateful memories of the Commonwealth time, and the tyrannical burdens then imposed upon the

The Tobacco Tax.

very necessaries of life. It was supposed to mean summary powers of jurisdiction, inspection, and search over every Englishman's house. Even the landowners rejected it. Their enemy should find it was vain to spread his net in their sight. Locke had lately proved to their satisfaction that all duties on home products must fall ultimately on the land. They thought, if the land-tax was repealed, it would only be revived in a stricter form on the first occasion of need. The traders thought the intention was to replace all customs duties by a general excise, which would somehow bring to an end their immunity from taxation. The common people foresaw an army of officials ranging the country, every citizen at the mercy of an informer, the labourer driven to live on roots, and the Englishman reduced to French slavery and sabots. "No slavery, no excise, no wooden shoes," was the current shibboleth. The soldiers were told their tobacco would rise to a prohibitive price; the colonels reported that the regiments were ripe for mutiny. Even the corporation of London was, or pretended to be, as frantic as the mob, and attempted to intimidate Parliament. Pamphlets and petitions poured forth against "that monster the excise." In vain Walpole pointed out in the House that under the present system both the planters and the honest traders were half ruined; that while the gross tax on tobacco was £754,000, its net produce was only £161,000; that one-third of the tobacco imported was known to escape the duty. In vain he reasoned that there was already an excise to the amount of over £3,000,000 a year working quite smoothly; that the dreaded army of officials would amount to 126, all told; that the right of search was to be more limited than that already exercised under the customs laws; that his plan would make London practically a free port and the central market of the world. When he offered reduction of the Debt or repeal of the taxes on soap and candles, Wyndham answered that he would prefer to this excise a land-tax of 10s. in the £, for liberty would then be secured and taxation no heavier. When he referred to Cope's report, Wyndham asked, Should we sacrifice the constitution to the prevention of frauds in the revenue? That Pulteney should denounce the whole thing as a mere scheme to entangle the inland boroughs in

The Agitation Against the Excise Bill.

that network of Crown influence which the customs already spread over the sea-ports, was natural enough. But it is hard to believe in the sincerity of Sir John Barnard, a leader in the business world, when he urged that only warehousing without an excise would content the merchants; that the existing excises were not a success; that Walpole had misstated the number of new officials required; and that, if he had his way, London would be not the most free port in the world but the most troublesome. All Walpole's enemies seized the opportunity, and swelled the outcry of irrational invective. His majority went down from 61 to 17. True, this was on a side issue. He could still have passed his measure. But it is doubtful if it could have been carried into execution — certainly not without bloodshed; "and I will not be the minister," he said to his supporters, "to enforce taxes at the expense of blood," adding, in a tone more congenial to his natural humour, "this dance will no further go." He bowed to the storm, and announced that for prudential reasons he seceded from that which he thought as right as ever.

The Bill Dropped.

It was a strange object-lesson as to the value of catchwords in politics. Had it but been called, as Lord Chesterfield in after years cynically remarked, an Act for the better securing the liberty and property of his Majesty's subjects by repealing some of the most burdensome custom-house laws, it would have been welcomed by all classes. As things were, its withdrawal was received with a roar of triumph from the whole nation. Men wore cockades marked, "Liberty, Property, and no Excise." Bonfires blazed in the London streets. At Oxford for three nights the gown treated the town to strong drinks and irrelevant huzzas for "James the Third." A generation later, in the sturdy prejudices of Dr. Johnson, excise was still "a hateful tax levied upon commodities, and adjudged by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid."

It has been said that after such a defeat a minister should have resigned. But constitutional morality in that day did not profess to be scrupulous. Instead of resigning, he inflicted a sharp and merited punishment on a group of noble lords who had long been caballing against him, though ostensibly his supporters and some of them even

his colleagues. It was well for the prosperity of England to have nine years more of peace and sound finance under his rule; but for all that, his position was seriously shaken, and in the new Parliament of 1735 his majority was much diminished.

The National Debt.

In 1714 the Debt stood at £52,000,000, and the annual charge upon it was nearly £3,500,000. A large part of the Debt was also unfunded. Swift said this burden was ruinous. Bolingbroke denounced it as incredible to future generations, and almost so to the present. Stanhope, with greater prescience, said it would grow much more, and need cause us no uneasiness. But many were alarmed. Moreover, at a time when the statutory rate of interest had been fixed at 5 per cent., when Holland could borrow at 4 per cent., and when, as a member said in the House of Commons, large advances could be got in ordinary business at 4 per cent., it began to be felt as absurd that 6, 7, or even 8 per cent. should still be paid as interest to fundholders. In 1710 Defoe wrote his excellent tract "On Loans," in which he sketched the creation of the Funds, which at first had to be encouraged by high interest, by premiums, and by lotteries. These led to speculation. From this, and from the dealing in securities issued for old arrears of taxes, and from the want of cash at the time of the recoinage, had arisen "the art and mystery of stockjobbing, when the whole City seemed turned into a corporation of usury." He was writing on Harley's behalf to combat the idea that this new "moneyed interest" was so Whig in its politics that a Tory administration would find itself unable to continue borrowing. High interest and good credit, he soundly remarks, will bring in loans despite all the parties and conspiracies in the world; the people can now no more do without the funds than the funds can do without them; no party can stop loans any more than they could stop the tide at London Bridge. He points out that when credit improved and Parliament was seen resolute to uphold it,

"you took off your premios; you drew no more lotteries for sixteen years; you lowered your interest, you brought your annuities from 14 to 7 per cent., your interest on tallies from 7 to 6 per cent.; . . . had you brought the general interest of loans to 4 per cent., they must have come down."

These were trenchant facts; and it was thus that Harley was enabled to form the South Sea Company in 1711, and so to provide for the floating debt of £10,000,000, funding it and securing the interest on wine and tobacco and other duties; the new Company, in return for their £10,000,000, being promised the monopoly of trade with Spanish South America, and of the privileges to be granted in the Treaty of Utrecht. It was declared a scheme worthy of Sully or Colbert. It was to be the Tory counterpart to Montague's Bank of England and East India Company. But the new shares only stood as yet at 77; and the Treaty only allowed a limited trade in negroes, a few factories, and the despatch of one annual ship to the Spanish colonies. As the first ship was not despatched till 1717, and war with Spain broke out again in 1718, the Company cannot ever have been on a sound basis. Walpole, however, in 1717, had framed a plan for the Bank to lend £2,500,000, and the Company £2,000,000, at interest reduced from 6 to 5 per cent., to buy up the short annuities which had still twenty-three years to run, and to pay off some of the redeemable Debt. He had resigned office the very day the plan was presented; but it was carried out by Stanhope. Two years later the Company offered to buy up £800,000 a year more of irredeemable annuities. It is remarkable that within six days two-thirds of the annuity-holders had accepted the terms, and South Sea stock had gone up to 123½. The Bank was more cautious than its rival, and was accused of being backward to reduce the public debts. Aislabie openly said, "The moneyed men want a check, and to be made to know that the landed men are masters of the main spring and stock of the wealth and strength of the kingdom." Law's schemes, now "at their meridian of success in December, 1719" (Anderson), had spread a sort of infection; there was no proper organ of financial criticism at the time; and in a few weeks the Company had offered to take up £31,000,000 more of annuities. When the Bank made a rival offer, the South Sea directors outbid them by offering to pay £7,500,000 to the Exchequer before the close of 1720. Walpole spoke for the Bank, but the other offer was accepted. Its very magnitude spread the idea that the South Sea Company

The South Sea Company.

had some talismanic secret. Its stock had now risen to 400. There were rumours that Gibraltar would be exchanged for some ports in Peru. It was known that several leading ministers were hand-in-glove with the directors. For the next six months England became a stockjobbing Bedlam. The Company actually increased its obligations, and with every increase the frenzy of investors grew more eager. On 12th April, £2,000,000 more was subscribed at 300; on the 23rd a fresh issue of £1,500,000 was made at 400. The directors declared a midsummer dividend of 10 per cent. On the 2nd June the stock was 890 in the morning, 640 in the afternoon, 750 in the evening. In July a new issue of £4,000,000 sold at 1,000. The top price, 1,060, had been reached on 25th June. The great fraud produced a host of lesser frauds. Over one hundred schemes, "bubbles or mere cheats," were floated; "a company for a wheel for perpetual motion, £1,000,000"; "a company for carrying on an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is" (this ingenious promoter got 1,000 subscriptions by midday, and decamped with them that afternoon *); "for erecting hospitals for bastard children, £2,000,000"; "for transmutation of quicksilver into a fine metal," and so on. It is often said that the action of the South Sea directors in July, in getting these companies declared illegal, caused the collapse of their own bubble. But the general infatuation was proof against that shock, and on 31st August the market price was still 810. In September it fell rapidly; by the 9th it was 550; by the 21st, 150. "Their fast friends now drew off, including the Tories, Jacobites, and Papists, for these they have all along hugged; . . . . the goldsmiths are daily going off, not a quarter of them will stand" (says a contemporary letter of Thomas Brodrick). There was one man, and only one, who could alleviate, if not stay, the disaster. All parties cast their eyes on Walpole. He had himself sold out at £1,000; but he had opposed the whole project, he had proved a true prophet. Now he had to meet the panic without overloading State credit; to hold a strict inquiry into ministers' conduct

The South Sea Bubble.

The Collapse.

* His proposal, after all, only anticipated one of the operations of the modern "outside broker"—a "blind pool" in an unspecified stock.

without ruining the Whig party; to make signal examples of the guilty directors, but not mere victims. A peer had suggested they should be treated as parricides were in Rome. Petitions clamoured for vengeance on the cannibals of Change Alley who would have licked the last drops of the nation's blood. Eventually, thanks to Walpole, the directors got off with fines varying from the whole to a small fraction of their respective property; the total levied from them was £2,000,000. The fates of the ministers are well known; the deaths of Stanhope and Craggs, the suicide of Craggs the elder, the resignation of Sunderland, the severe punishment of Aislabie and others. Aislabie alone—who had put himself and friends down for £797,000 and then burnt his accounts—Walpole dared not defend. Finally, after several abortive schemes to get the Bank to take up part of the Company's stock, it was settled that the £7,000,000 which the Company stood pledged to pay over to Government should be remitted, and every shareholder receive £33 6s. 8d. on £100 stock.

The Sinking Fund.

Once more the extinction of the Debt had to be left to the humdrum methods of frugality and good management. The belief in hey-presto finance and in royal roads to national solvency should have now had its quietus. But in fact it held on to a last refuge, "the sacred sinking fund." This was at first a genuine surplus, the saving of £322,234, effected chiefly by the reduction of interest from 6 to 5 per cent. on a part of the Debt in 1717, and it was consecrated primarily to paying off debt incurred before 1716. Further steps brought the sinking fund to £1,200,000 a year by 1728. But it came in the popular imagination to be a sort of magical and costless device for the automatic extinction of debt by the operation of compound interest. To the embarrassed statesman it was an irresistible temptation, a well-spring of supply in an emergency; and when can a financier not plead emergency? If only the sinking-fund were kept up fresh debt could be created without popular alarm. Thus in both ways it acted as an anodyne to the national conscience. Now and then this conscience half awoke and stirred uneasily; as in 1728, when the discovery was made that only £2,500,000 had been paid off since 1716, there was an agitation by the Press, a great debate in the House; but finally a protest by the Whig

Commons that all was well, and the nation might sleep again. Again in 1732, the fund was deprived of the Salt Tax, charged with the extra Civil List, and shorn of £500,000, to enable the land-tax to be lowered to 1s. In vain Barnard exclaimed that the author of such an expedient must expect the curses of posterity; and Pulteney mockingly proposed for Walpole the title of "Father," not of the sinking fund, but "Father of the Standing Army and the Excise." In 1733 Carteret attributed "the daily decay of our trade" to the spoliation of this "sacred fund"; the current service of the year ought to be met in the year, was his principle—a principle to which present-day politicians do not yet adhere, save when in opposition. Wyndham had asked what right there was to suppose future times would be more prosperous; but it was too convenient a supposition not to be acted on. At the close of Walpole's long term of power the Debt was, for all those years of peace and prosperity, much the same as it had been at the close of Marlborough's great wars. If this is to be condoned it must be by remembering Walpole's position. He had to conciliate the landowners to the new dynasty; he had to retain the loyalty of the fundholders, two-thirds of whom, it was found in 1737, held under £1,000 each. He had to be ready for war with Spain. He had, above all, to preserve spotless and beyond suspicion "that fair virgin, Public Credit." In the well-known essay in the *Spectator*, the Pretender is seen with a sword in one hand, a sponge in the other; and no investor doubted which of the two was the more formidable weapon. Even when Barnard proposed in 1737 that reducing of interest to 3 per cent. and paying off the annuitants, which Pelham carried out soon after, it seemed a sufficient answer to point out that they did not wish it. It was urged further that it would be an injustice to the holders, who might in 1720 have claimed the whole amount of their bonds, "in which case the whole must have fallen on the landed interest." The proposal was defeated—one more illustration of the way in which public economy had to run on party and class lines, under an insecure dynasty. Walpole's good measures go to the credit of the financier; his bad must be set down to the peculiar difficulties surrounding the politician.

THE population of England and Wales was only 5,000,000 just before the Revolution; it was still hardly over 6,000,000 by 1742. The rate of increase was not to become rapid till after 1760. The relative numbers and earnings of each class remained, with one exception, much as they had been when Gregory King made his computations. That exception was the rise of certain towns—Sheffield, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Bristol, etc.—the districts, in fact, of the hardware and pottery, the cotton and woollen industries, and of the coalfields. In these, and other towns, the rise is very remarkable. Birmingham, for instance, increased seven-fold between 1685 and 1725. Men already began to say of England then, what in fact was not fully true till 1881, that half the people lived in towns. The changing balance of population was thus undoing the long supremacy of the Southern counties over the Northern. For though industrial history had not yet reached the epoch of the great inventions or of the factory system, yet there were even now causes at work which favoured industrial progress. These causes were the general advance in English commercial activity, the introduction of new processes and methods of manufacture from abroad (IV., pp. 450, 581), and the growing tendency to abandon the old fettering system of restriction and regulation. As to the first of these facts, there is abundant evidence in the augmenting volume of East Indian and West American and North American trade, in the marked rise of the customs receipts, and in the success of the Navigation Acts. The third cause, the most important of all, displayed itself in several ways. The assessments of wages by Justices in Quarter Sessions died out in this period; the statutes of apprenticeship became a dead letter, and the restrictive powers of town corporations were seen to be obsolete and a mere nuisance. The places where industry flourished were those which would have none of these things. The great fact was disclosing itself, that in a vigorous and populous community competition could be trusted to work better than State regulation. Mediæval systems like the assize of bread, of beer, and of cloth, or the

A. L. SMITH. The Social Economy.

Economic Changes.

gilds, presupposed a country in which accumulation of capital was in its infancy and internal communications were very imperfect. But in the England of the eighteenth century the capitalist corn-dealer had made his appearance; and though canals may be said to date from (1761 : p. 323) the Bridgwater Canal to Manchester, yet Defoe's tour shows long before that date the great use made of river carriage, and the value of the turnpike roads established in the Midlands and extended by the general Highways Act of 1741. These roads at once lowered the cost of carriage by 1s. a cwt., and would (he prophesies) increase the consumption of fish a hundred-fold.

Among other favourable influences was the relative cheapness of wheat, due chiefly to a long run of good seasons. Wheaten bread was but slowly superseding among the labourers the use of rye, barley, and oatmeal. The spread of enclosures, though to contemporaries they seemed by no means an unmixed good, must at least have added immensely to the productive powers of the land. It is true that the area thus enclosed in the first sixty years of the century was a small amount (3,000,000 acres) compared with what was done in the next period. It is noticeable, too, that Eden's figures show that agricultural rents were almost stationary between 1689 and 1795. The prosperity of the rural classes depended more, it is clear, on the prevalence of by-industries, which were so marked a feature of the Eastern counties, and of Devon, Somerset, Gloucester, Worcester, and the West Riding. There, "a child of four or five years old could earn its own bread." Thus, of the five main processes required in the manufacture of cloth, three (the spinning of the yarn, the weaving of the cloth, the dressing of the cloth) were performed by cottagers and their families working at home. In agricultural wages proper there was little improvement: there was a rise of 20 per cent., according to Professor Thorold Rogers; but it is curious to find the statement, in the original seventeenth-century edition of Chamberlayne's "Britanniæ Notitia," that English day labourers are better off in dwellings, diet, and apparel, than farmers in other countries, followed in the edition of 1755 by this significant correction: "Their wages being but 8d. or 10d. a day . . . those who have large families find it very difficult frequently to find them bread."

The best general view of the country about this time is to

be found in Defoe's Tour, 1724-5.* It leaves a strong general impression of the wealth and ease that had come in since the Revolution. Many districts we see prosperous by cottage industries; Norfolk and Essex, Devon, Somerset, Wilts, Dorset, Gloucester, Leicestershire, and the West Riding. Kent was decaying; but some 1,500 "graycoats" who were yeomen still came in at election times in the Maidstone district. The North seems still like a different country, "wild, barren, and frightful," except in the scattered industrial centres. He is always ready to point out how the whole country contributes to the sustenance of London; even from the far North great droves of cattle are sent to be fattened in the Eastern counties marshes for the London markets. In the South the one main industry, from Thames mouth to Land's End, he declares to be smuggling. In Bristol he traces the crippling effects of a Corporation. He notes the chief homes of dissent: Bristol, Bridgwater, Taunton, Devonshire, Reading, Newcastle. He gives a vivid description of the great fairs, Stourbridge, Penkridge, Horn Fair, and the Mop Fairs. He denounces the scenes at the race meetings, Newmarket and elsewhere; but is full of compliments on the polite society of many of the country towns whose annual winter or summer "seasons" had not been absorbed into that of the capital.

The Poor Law.

Defoe's Tour gives the bright side of things; it is touched with the smug optimism characteristic of British prosperity. The dark side must be studied in the Poor Law history. The history tells us indeed that the cost of poor relief had fallen from £819,000 in 1698 to £689,000 in 1750. But this was bought at a price that was to come heavy on posterity; for it was effected by a ruthless and vigilant exercise of the Settlement Law of 1662. The economic effects of the law are the subject of a well-known chapter in Adam Smith. Its actual working is best described by a contemporary Justice (Burn):—

> "The office of an overseer seems to be understood to be this: . . . to prevent persons coming to inhabit without certificates; . . . if a man brings a certificate, to caution all the inhabitants not to let him a farm of £10 a year; . . . to warn them, if they will hire servants, to hire them half-yearly; . . . to maintain their poor as cheap as they possibly

* The republication of 1742, which claims to be more accurate and condensed, succeeds at least in being more dull and uninstructive.

can; . . . to bargain with some sturdy person to take them by the lump, who yet is not intended to take them but to hang over them *in terrorem*; . . . to bind out poor children apprentices, no matter to whom or to what trade, but to take special care that the master live in another parish; . . . to pull down cottages . . . to depopulate the parish."

This passage enables us to understand the "open war against cottages as nests of beggars' brats" (Arthur Young), the "division of the whole country into belligerent districts," and "the worst grievance of the poor, the impossibility of getting habitations" (Eden). In some few places, no doubt, these laws must have been practically suspended, or else the growth of the great towns would be inexplicable. But what could be the general effect of a harsh law entrusted to the hands of some 20,000 annually appointed unpaid overseers? It might well be true, as Adam Smith declared, that no poor man could reach forty years without suffering grievous oppression under this law at some time or other. The legislature acknowledged there were abuses when, under George II., it passed Acts to force overseers to render yearly accounts, to prevent their giving orders for relief in kind to be paid at specified shops, to control their lists of permanent cases, and to make them more liberal with the "certificates" without which a labourer could not leave his parish. With the same feeling of checking overseers' tyranny it had become common for justices to order relief without reference to the overseers; and the Act of George I. only modified this power by delaying the action of a justice till, relief having been refused by overseers, he had summoned them to show cause. The arbitrary powers thus committed to irresponsible and ill-qualified officials were destined before the close of the century to manifest their disastrous results to the full.

Workhouses.

Besides this interference by the justices, and the continuance of Settlement Laws, there was one more fact of capital importance in the Poor Law history of the period. This was the Act of 1722, providing for the erection of workhouses and the offering of relief in the workhouses, and only in them. Here we have the "workhouse test," which has been since 1834 more and more clearly recognised as the cardinal principle of sound administration. It is strange, therefore, that a recent German work should state that between 1601 and 1760 the legislature

made no changes of principle in the Poor Law system. The fact is, that the "Account of Several Workhouses," published in 1725 and again in 1732, shows that about sixty were in working, and with remarkable results. Lord Mansfield, in 1782, said they had cut down the poor rate by one-half; and the returns are still extant which prove that annual expenses went down from £566 to £275 at St. Albans, from £945 to £574 at Chatham, from £170 to £100 at Harborough, and so on. Not merely could a man be kept for 17d. or 18d. a week who had cost twice as much out of the workhouse, but "great numbers of lazy people, rather than submit to the workhouse, are content to throw off the mask and maintain themselves." Unfortunately the very term "workhouse" fluctuated in meaning between the three senses of asylum, house of correction, public workshop. The new workhouses, too, often drifted into the practical fallacy of "finding work" for the unemployed, a fallacy as rife then as now; though Defoe, in his admirable pamphlet, "Giving Alms no Charity," had pierced it through and through. The true value and use of workhouses was better seen by Hay, whose Bill, 1736, proposed to make them general, to apply them as a test, to group parishes into unions, to control the overseers by guardians appointed from the gentry. But the cry was raised that this meant a general poor rate, a cry nearly as potent as that against a general excise. So wide a social reform ran counter to Walpole's maxim, "Quieta non movere," and the Bill was rejected. The original institution of workhouses had been as houses of correction, and this purpose they still continued to serve. The existing laws against vagrants were summed up in a drastic Statute of 1743, which included fencers, bearwards, players, minstrels, jugglers, gipsies. The plan was to set them to a task; for it had been discovered that "work was worse than death to them."

The Poor Law system had then some merits and many defects; its merits were that the impotent and aged poor were humanely treated. The Act of 1722 and the Affiliation Act of 1732 were important and salutary. The poor rate was steadily declining in amount; there were not a few writers and practical men who took a just view of the facts. On the other hand, its defects were many; conflict of jurisdiction, neglect of the law ordering registers and accounts, want of

uniformity and incorporation, inefficiency of the overseers, prevalence of "party-jobs and private views," and certain signs of a sentimental wave ominous for the future.

The Increase of Drunkenness.

Besides the Poor Law, the savage and stupid penal code of the time, the impudent openness of robbery and violence, the revolting callousness and intrigue of society, the admixture of the brutal and the mawkish that is so striking in the literature —all these make it difficult to read with fairness the periodicals of the "pudding times" of the two Georges. It is quite what might be expected that the English who, since the Restoration, had been displacing Danes and Dutch in reputation as topers, now fell into the worst of all drunken habits — the habit of gin drinking. Till 1723 this vice remained a privilege of the rich, for brandy and rum were dear; brandy as an import from France being heavily taxed, and rum being a protected colonial product. But now the distillers began to produce whisky and gin. It was urged in Parliamentary debate that the decline in beer and ale would injure the agricultural interest; the decline in rum would ruin our West Indian colonies. Vested interests, the cause of the poor, the liberty of Britons, the morality of moderate drinking, the unwholesomeness of "Parliament brandy," the perquisites of the Civil List, were the considerations invoked on the other side, against Jekyll's Gin Act. This Act tried to stamp out the evil by a duty of 20s. a gallon, and by charging £50 for a licence. Its chief results were riots and clandestine sale. The consumption of British spirits had been in 1727 three and a half million of gallons, and in 1735 nearly five and a half; by 1742 it was 7,162,000. But the retailers continued to offer men to be "drunk for 1d., dead drunk for 2d., and straw for nothing." The increase of robbers, the growth of pauperism, the appearance of new diseases, were all ascribed to gin. In 1743 the duty was abruptly dropped to 1d. a gallon; by 1751, when the maximum was reached, the consumption was 11,000,000 gallons, the number of gin shops "within the Bills of Mortality" (a significant conjunction) was said to be 17,000; and London and the great towns long continued to be "more like a scene of a Bacchanal than the residence of a civil society."

DURING the twenty-eight years of Walpole's administration no fundamental change took place in the characteristics of English social life. Throughout the ranks of society a certain inertness and passivity, a careless submission to existing conditions may be noted; all but a few sharp-tongued malcontents like Swift, Lady Mary Montague, Lord Hervey, and Sir Horace Walpole, accepted those pleasures which the world had to offer and were not dissatisfied. The absence of any signs of intellectual or moral progress caused no distress. The signs of the times were noted, but their tendency was not resisted; they were accepted as unalterable facts, and to sagaciously acknowledge the facts of human nature without idealisation was esteemed true wisdom. Society was aware of the existence of critics, who despised human nature and took pleasure in carping, but the verdict of the critics did not carry weight. They were not united, and did not evince in their own conduct that zeal for reform which they urged upon others.

M. BATESON. Social Life.

As yet the word "shocking" had not become common in the vocabulary of fashion;* and vivacious Court ladies like Miss † Bellenden, Miss Lepel, Miss Howe, and Miss Vane had no cause to fear that their *étourderie* would expose them to the charge of immodesty. Only towards the end of the period the signs of a change are seen—a change from boorish behaviour to the opposite extreme of stilted politeness, from the manners of Walpole to the manners of Chesterfield.

George I., hating the parade of royalty and unable to express himself in English, gathered few English ladies and fewer men about his court. His evening parties were presided over by his mistresses, the Duchess of Kendal (Mme. Schulemberg) and the Countess of Darlington (Mme. Kilmansegg). His unfortunate taste for plain women made him a public laughing-stock, and both ladies were in every way ill-fitted to become leaders of society.

The Court.

A more considerable influence than the court of George I. was the court of the Prince of Wales, who left St. James's

* *Cf.* Fielding's "Covent Garden Journal," 1752.

† The word was now applied, together with Mrs., to unmarried women of good reputation.

Palace in 1717, after his quarrel with his father, for Leicester House, in the north-east corner of the square then called Leicester Fields. The Princess Caroline's strong personality won for her many friends, and the Prince's mistresses were sprightly and English. All the liveliest members of society came to their reunions twice a week, and their "drawing-room" every morning was largely attended. When the Prince of Wales succeeded to the throne, crowds came to see majesty dine in public, a sight that Anne and George I. had not permitted their subjects to enjoy.

Court Manners.

Common-sense and good-nature were the virtues which George I., George II., and Queen Caroline esteemed highly, for they possessed them in uncommon measure, and they were virtues on which society at large then set an unusually high value. Only in one or two points did this royal group allow a certain margin for sentiment. In one respect at least their delicacy found few imitators. Both George II. and his queen considered it indelicate to be ill, and would submit to tortures rather than confess to pain. Equally at variance with their usual strong sense, but more unfortunate as an example, was the "gallantry" of George I. and George II., which they believed to be essential to their position. The queen's doctrine, on the other hand, was that all "romance" or sentiment was contemptible, and she allowed herself to become the confidante of her husband's intrigues.*

The *brusquerie* of the queen's daily language was recognised as something exceptional by her contemporaries. The Duchess of Marlborough observed that, when Frederick Prince of Wales established his rival court at Norfolk House,

> "the young Princess of Wales' conversation was more proper for a drawing-room than the wise Queen Caroline's was, who never was half an hour without saying something shocking to somebody or other, even when she intended to oblige, and generally very improper discourse for a public room." †

George II., his queen, and Walpole had a great command of rude language and simile. George's favourite exclamations

* Hervey, "Memoirs," ii., p. 168. Horace Walpole, "Reminiscences." Campbell's "Life of Lord Chancellor King."

† Extracts from letters of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, in Cunningham's edition of "Walpole's Letters," I. cliii.

were "Pooh!" "Stuff!" He called all his ministers rogues, scoundrels, rascals, dirty buffoons, impertinent fools, stinking, choleric blockheads, and talkers of fiddle-faddle. But humour of such a gross description as that in which Charles II. indulged was now reserved for Sir Robert Walpole; and what was once not offensive in the manners of a king famed for good breeding stamped Walpole, whose manners were those of the country squire, as an ill-bred man.

Those who travelled abroad regretted the absence of refinement in English manners. In some circles, however, knowledge of the "usage of the world," graceful movements, and choice language received their due reward. There was a circle possessed of "the distinguishing diction that marks the man of fashion, a certain language of conversation that every gentleman should be master of." Chesterfield teaches that it is boorish to congratulate a friend on his approaching marriage with merely, "I wish you joy." What should be said is, "Believe me, my dear sir, I have scarce words to express the joy I feel upon your happy alliance with such or such a family." The "compliments of condolence" on a bereavement should be, not, "I am sorry for your loss," but, "I hope, sir, you will do me the justice to be persuaded that I am not insensible of your unhappiness, that I take part in your distress, and shall ever be affected when *you* are so."*

Aristocratic Good-breeding.

His child began his lessons in "breeding" at nine years old, having till then learnt Latin, Greek, French, history, and geography. He is warned to beware of using proverbial sayings in his speech, such as, "One man's meat is another man's poison," or, "Everyone as they like, as the good man said when he kissed his cow." He must attend to the graceful motion of his arms, the manner of putting on his hat and giving his hand.

Horace Walpole's entrance into a room is described by an eye-witness as

"in the style of affected delicacy which fashion had made almost natural, *chapeau bras* between his hands, as if he wished to compress it, or under his arm: knees bent, and feet on tiptoe, as if afraid of a wet floor."

* Stone, "Chronicles of Fashion," ii., p. 330.

Men's Dress.

The long wigs, with curls reaching almost to the waist, were no longer worn, and the ends of the wig were either plaited in a pig-tail or put in a black silk bag. The "pretty gentleman" wore a "toupee" of curls raised high over his forehead. For daily wear most gentlemen were dressed, like George I., in a dark tie-wig, plain coat, waistcoat and breeches of snuff-coloured cloth, and stockings of the same colour; for ceremony, like Horace Walpole, in a lavender suit, the waistcoat embroidered with a little silver or of white silk embroidered in the tambour-frame, partridge-silk stockings, gold buckles, ruffles, lace frill and powdered wig. Early in the period shoulder-knots were worn, and beads were fastened to the end of the cravat to correct the stubbornness of the muslin. The linen for shirts was bought in Holland, costing from ten to fourteen shillings the English ell* (45 inches).

Women's Dress.

During the first few years of George I.'s reign the poor, countrypeople and servants, and even the gentry, were wearing Indian chintzes and Dutch-printed calicoes. The riots of the wool and silk weavers in 1719, and the attacks made on women who ventured to wear these materials in the streets, led ultimately to legislation (p. 112); and in 1722 ladies were busy pulling their calico gowns to pieces to make them into quilts and furniture-covers, as they were forbidden to wear them. Instead they wore dimities, linens sprigged with flowers, fine holland worked by their own hands, at the risk of having these too torn from their backs by the enraged weavers.†

Queen Caroline had no taste in dress; at her coronation she wore finery which her friend, Lord Hervey, describes as a mixture of magnificence and meanness. Upon her person was bestowed £2,400,000 worth of jewels, all borrowed. Throughout the period hoops were worn, and the bulk of the skirt permitted very large patterns to be used in the brocades. A lady appeared at the Princess Royal's wedding in the fashionable "lutestring" (corded silk) at 13s. a yard, which, she says, was "brocaded with great ramping flowers in shades of purples, reds, and greens." The Duchess of Bedford's petticoat was green paduasoy, embroidered very richly with gold

* 1734, Chesterfield writes to the Hague for four dozen Holland shirts.

† Lee's "Defoe," iii. 92, etc.

and silver and a few colours; the pattern was festoons of shells, corals, corn, cornflowers, and seaweeds. Another dress is described as "festoons of nothing at all," supported by pillars in brocade, and interspersed with flowerpots of flowers.

"The Duchess of Queensberry's clothes pleased me best; they were white satin embroidered, the bottom of the petticoat *brown hills*, covered with all sorts of weeds, and *every breadth* had *an old stump of a tree* that run up almost to the top of the petticoat, broken and ragged and worked with brown chenille, round which twined nastertians, ivy, honeysuckles, periwinkles, convolvuluses, and all sorts of twining flowers which spread and covered the petticoat, vines with the leaves variegated as you have seen them by the sun, all rather smaller than nature, which made them look very bright; the robings and facings were little green banks with all sorts of weeds, and the sleeves and the rest of the gown loose twining branches of the same sort as those on the petticoat; many of the leaves were finished with gold, and part of the stumps of the trees looked like the gilding of the sun. I never saw a piece of work so prettily fancied, and am quite angry with myself for not having the same thought, for it is infinitely handsomer than mine, and could *not* cost *much more*."

In a moment of gloom the writer of this description says, "I grow sick of the word 'fine' and all its appurtenances." The Duchess of Queensberry, however, was not always fine; she arrived on one occasion at a party "in a mob and white hood pinned close under her chin, yellow mohair gown, no ruffles, only little frills sewed to her shift, no hoop, a tumbled apron, and her capuchin (hood) dangling round her arm."

Masquerades.

It was a period in which fancy-dress balls were popular and the pursuit of pleasure at the masquerade was unflagging. Anne had disapproved of masquerades, and would not allow Heidegger, the famous opera manager (p. 93), to introduce them. In 1716 Chesterfield writes to Dodington that "balls, assemblies, and masquerades take the place of the dull formal visiting-days" of Anne's time. The masquerades were at first held at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket, and subscription-tickets were bought at White's Chocolate House. Every effort was made to confine the audience to the "quality," and to prevent drunkenness and disorder, but without success. The Grand Jury presented the King's Theatre in its list of nuisances, "conceiving the same to be an unlawful design to carry on gaming." In 1726 the Bishop of London preached against

masquerades in Bow Church before the Society for the Reformation of Manners. A royal proclamation was issued against them, but as the king and prince attended them, and as Heidegger was made Master of the Revels, they continued in fashion, under the name of "Ridottos." In 1727 Mrs. Pendarves writes: "Masquerades are not to be forbid, but there is to be another entertainment bare-faced, which are balls" (*sic*). In 1729 the Grand Jury of Middlesex again presented masquerades as the principal promoters of vice and immorality.

Ranelagh.

In 1733 a villa belonging to Viscount Ranelagh in Chelsea, which was then a country district, was bought by a builder for £3,200. In 1742 the grounds had been laid out. Horace Walpole writes (May 26th, 1742):—

"Two nights ago Ranelagh Gardens were opened at Chelsea. The Prince, Princess, the Duke (of Cumberland), much nobility and much mob besides were there. There is a vast amphitheatre, finely gilt, painted and illuminated, into which everybody that loves eating, drinking, staring, or crowding, is admitted for 1s. Building and laying out the gardens cost £16,000. Twice a week there are to be Ridottos at guinea tickets, for which you are to have supper and music. I was there last night, but did not find the joy of it. Vauxhall is a little better, for the garden is pleasanter and one goes by water."

Other Gardens.

Under Jonathan Tyer, Vauxhall had recovered its reputation, and it was reopened (1736), decorated with designs by Hogarth. The humbler citizens went for similar entertainments to Sadler's Wells, Islington, and Cupar's Gardens, Lambeth, opposite Somerset House. Marylebone Gardens were fashionable for breakfast parties, for bowling and for cold bathing in the open air.

Theatre.

National feeling, irrespective of religious sentiment, was hostile to the drama. Only a small class frequented the theatres, for the world of fashion had withdrawn to the opera-house. To create counter-attractions the theatres started pantomimes and harlequinades, and the legitimate drama was banished until the close of the period, when Garrick began to act Shakespeare in the Goodman Fields' Theatre. In 1728 the success of Gay's *Beggar's Opera* at Lincoln's Inn Fields gave a brief impulse to the drama as a political instrument; but the Court party was able to

suppress as "licentious"* all plays which were hostile to the government. The *Beggar's Opera* ran fifty nights at Bristol, Bath, and other provincial towns, and by the thirty-sixth night in London, Gay had made £800, and Rich, the manager, £4,000. Lavinia Fenton, who made the part of Polly, received only thirty shillings a week, but was rewarded for her efforts by becoming the wife of the Duke of Bolton. In 1731 Covent Garden Theatre was built, but opera languished, and at the close of the period the fashionable world was seeking oratorio for variety (p. 95). In 1734 an oratorio by Porpora was performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields; Mrs. Pendarves found it too solemn for a theatre, and preferred Handel's oratorios, *Esther* and *Deborah*. In 1741 elaborate scenery was tried at the opera-house, with improved dancing, and for a while "the town" ran after it. Horace Walpole says:

> They have flung open the stage to a great length, and made a perfect view of Venice, with the Rialto and numbers of gondolas that row about full of masks, who land and dance."

Cards.

The love of card-playing, which had formerly been characteristic of aristocratic circles only, now infected all alike. The favourite games at court were "quadrille," an improvement on ombre, and "commerce." Both games depended on the stakes for their interest. Writing in 1733, Chesterfield says to Lady Suffolk:—

> "Your Hampton Court recreations, I find, give the lie to those who complain of the uncertainty and instability of Courts, since the same joyous measures have for these sixteen revolving years been steadily pursued without interruption. Commerce must surely have played its cards excellently well, to have kept its ground so long or——the first courteous opener of this letter may insert the rest."†

In the king's absence, Hervey writes that "the Queen at St. James's passed her common evenings just as she had done at Kensington"—that is, in her private apartments playing "quadrille" with two ladies, whilst the Princess Caroline, a maid of honour, and Lord Hervey played pools at "cribbage"; and the duke, Princess Emily, and the rest of the chance-comers of the family played at basset.

The gains and losses of the king and queen were, as a

* Hervey, "Memoirs," iii. 142.

† The letters of the time are full of complaints of Post Office espionage.

rule, restricted to hundreds; but on Twelfth Night it was customary for thousands of pounds to change hands. Lady Cowper, a lady in waiting, for the sake of her children refused to sit down to play, as none sat down to the table with less than £200.*

The ladies who gambled at the Belsize tables, Hampstead, and at Richmond, had great difficulty in reaching town with their gains, as they were systematically attacked on the road by highwaymen.†

At the end of the period a rage for whisk, or whist, set in, but at first it was considered too wise a game for ladies to join in. In 1742 Horace Walpole found it absolutely necessary to learn it, as he waited "in vain for its being left off."

Card-playing for the time being displaced reading and intelligent conversation, but it assisted in uniting the sexes. George II. hated books, and Caroline was only suffered to read her Rollin by stealth. The "philosophical virtuosi" no longer held the place in society which once had been theirs. Sometimes a duchess kept a literary man attached to her household, but in England no ladies attempted to lead a "salon," and foreigners like Angeloni noted the contempt which was shown in England for women's literary opinions. Few women but the queen showed any interest in politics.

Speculation.

The absence of intellectual speculation was made up for by speculation at cards, in lotteries and raffles. Most female shopping was done on the raffling system. It is impossible to open a volume of the correspondence of the period without finding references to the writer's anxiety about the fate of lottery tickets ‡ or South Sea shares (p. 128). In 1720, Smollett says:

"Exchange Alley was filled with a strange concourse of statesmen and clergymen, churchmen and dissenters, Whigs and Tories, physicians and lawyers, tradesmen, and even females; all other professions and employments were utterly neglected."

The streets were full of the South Sea equipages of the newly enriched; three thousand gold watches were at women's sides,

* "Diary," p. 14; Doran, "London in Jacobite Times," ii. 27. Letter-Books of John Hervey, first Earl of Bristol (1894), iii. 29, etc.

† Lee's "Defoe," ii. 59.

‡ *Cf.* Lady M. W. Montague, ii. 5.

bought by South Sea fortunes. Defoe writes, "Don't you know a South Sea face?" There were two kinds—one as stock rose, another as it fell. After the fatal 24th of June, he writes:—

"You may now at a tavern have a mutton cutlet broil'd by Blousabella, the kitchen damsel, without being teaz'd with her enquiries of what new subscriptions are come out that day. You may go to the coffee house and call for a dish of tea or coffee and have it without difficulty, whereas if you said, 'Jack, give me a dish of Bohea,' he would presently say—without taking notice of what you call'd for—'Sir, will you buy a thousand pound stock in rock, in rock-salt, or the ground fishery,' and so on, thro' all the rest. If you come not to his price, the blue apron'd dog would cry, 'Sir, I'll give you a thousand pound a share for as many as you will bring me,' and so in proportion for any bubble that was afoot."

The miseries caused by the losses in Change Alley were felt by all classes in town, and by the upper classes in the country; numbers committed suicide. Some joined the ranks of the footpads and highwaymen.

Lawlessness.

The self-love which good-natured persons of the upper classes professed as evidence of their "strong sense," the contempt of humanity which the cynics boasted as evidence of their keen observation, showed themselves in the humbler ranks of society in contempt of law and order. Thefts, shoplifting, foot-padding, street assaults, and highway robbery were daily incidents, and the newspapers were full of lists of "lost"—that is, stolen—property, and of accounts of the insecurity of the streets. Those who ventured to cry "Stop, thief!" when their wigs were snatched from their heads were instantly shot dead, and no captures were made. Day after day, for weeks together, the Hampstead, Islington, and Hackney coaches were stopped in broad daylight and the passengers plundered. The mail from Bristol and London was robbed five times in as many weeks. The stage waggon between Notting Hill and Tyburn Gate was unloaded, a proceeding which took several daylight hours. Charing Cross, Holborn, Fleet Street, and St. Paul's Churchyard were the footpads' favourite haunts. In spite of the number of prisoners taken, the number of attacks did not diminish. Men were strung up on the gallows in tens and twenties, and many were shipped to the Plantations because on the weekly Tyburn hanging day there was not room upon

the gallows. The capital penalty had no deterrent effect, for hanging was considered a heroic end, and the processions to the gibbet were triumphal.* As in the French Cartouchian movement, to which Defoe compares this outbreak of disorder (1720-30), whole classes banded themselves together to prey upon society.

The Owlers leagued with the justices and landed gentry to defraud the customs; the Blacks in the Western counties were yeomen and well-to-do farmers organised for the purpose of burglary; the highwaymen were recruited from all ranks.† The death of the burglar Jack Sheppard on the gallows (1724), and the story of his marvellous escapes, inspired romantic youths to emulate him; and the story of Jonathan Wild, thief-taker and receiver of stolen goods, who was hanged in 1725, and of the highwayman Dick Turpin, hanged in 1739, increased the glory of those trades. Although the turnpikes were provided with speaking-trumpets which enabled them to put the neighbouring turnpikes on their guard, the impassableness of the by-ways prevented a systematic hue-and-cry. In 1728 Defoe wrote his "Method to prevent Street Robberies," and suggested that constables should be stout, able-bodied men, not aged and decrepit, and that the number of public lamps should be increased. But his suggestions were not put into effect.

Failure of the Reforming Societies.

The beginnings of a humanitarian movement seen in Anne's time (IV., p. 592) died away, and brutality was restored to its former reign. The great cavalcades of orphans with colours and streamers which had then paraded the streets no longer appeared. Defoe charges the Charitable Societies and the Societies for Reformation with talking much and doing little. They are "sunk and come to nothing." He asks, Why do not the societies, besides pursuing scandalous persons and putting down disorderly houses, prosecute for swearing, perjury, and unnecessary oaths? ‡ The methods open to the Society, convictions resulting in carting, whipping, and fines, did not admit of much good work, and its influence had also been tainted with suspicion of political partisanship.

* *Cf.* Malcolm, v. 30. † Lee's "Defoe," i. 340, etc.
‡ Lee's "Defoe," ii. 104.

In London the severance of the West from the East End, begun in the reign of Charles II., became more and more complete with the spread of the city westward. Fielding, writing in 1752,* says:

Growth of London.

"Within the memory of many now living the circle of the people of fascination (fashion) included the whole parish of Covent Garden and the greater part of St. Giles-in-the-fields; but here the enemy (the common people) broke in, and the circle was presently contracted to Leicester Fields and Golden Square. Hence the people of fashion again retreated before the foe to Hanover Square, whence they were once more driven to Grosvenor Square and even beyond it, and that with such precipitation that had they not been stopped by the walls of Hyde Park, it is more than probable they would by this time have arrived in Kensington."

Macky, writing in 1722, says:

"I am lodged in the street called Pall Mall, the ordinary residence of all strangers. If you would know our manner of living it is thus:—We rise by nine, and those that frequent great men's levees find entertainment at them till eleven, or, as in Holland, go to tea-tables. About twelve the *beau monde* assembles in several coffee or chocolate houses, the best of which are the Cocoa Tree and White's Chocolate-houses, St. James's, the Smyrna, Mrs. Rochford's and the British Coffee-houses, and all these so near to one another that in less than an hour you see the company of them all. We are carried to these places in chairs, which are here very cheap, a guinea a week, or one shilling per hour, and your chair-men serve you for porters to run on errands. . . . If it is fine weather we take a turn in the park till two, when we go to dinner, and if it be dirty, you are entertained at picket or basset at White's, or you may talk politics at Smyrna, or St. James's. I must not forget to tell you that the parties have their different places, where, however, a stranger is always well received, but a Whig will no more go to the Cocoa Tree or Osinda's than a Tory will be seen at the coffee-houses of St. James's. The Scots generally go to the British, and a mixture of all sorts to the Smyrna.

London Life.

"Ordinaries are not so common here as abroad, but there are good French ones in Suffolk Street. The general way here is to make a party at the coffee-house to go to dine at the tavern, where we sit till six, when we go to the play, except you are invited to the table of some great man. After the play the best company generally go to Tom's and Will's Coffee-houses near adjoining, where there is playing at picquet and the best of conversation till midnight. . . . Or if you like rather the company of ladies, there are assemblies at most people of quality's houses."

Garraway's, Robin's and Jonathan's coffee-houses near the Exchange, once fashionable resorts, were now frequented only by business men.

* "Covent Garden Journal," 1752.

Food and Drink.

At the end of Anne's reign the "coffee men" had been obliged to raise their prices owing to the taxes on coffee, tea, and newspapers, and charged for coffee 2d. per dish, green tea 1½d., and all drams 2d. per dram. Black tea was sold in 1710 from 12s. to 28s. a pound; green, 10s. to 16s.; Bohea and Pekoe were more costly. Smuggled, and "sophisticated," or adulterated, tea was used by the poorer classes: for the tax on tea was 5s. a pound. Coffee, in 1710, was at 5s. 8d.; chocolate, 3s. This was a year of average prices.* The Whigs would not touch French wine, but Tories refused the port which had come in through the Methuen Treaty of 1703, taking Tokay, Hermitage, Florence, "Irish wine" (claret),† or champagne and Burgundy, if they could be got, but French wines were a luxury of the rich, or of those who could get smuggled goods. At the same time the drinking of "punch" became fashionable; pale ale, bitter beer, and "entire," a new kind of beer, at 3d. a quart, also date from this period.

Chamberlayne, in his "State of England," 1711, writes that French soups and kickshaws, venison, fish, and fowl were seldom eaten but by the better sort, the commonalty eating butcher's meat and puddings, with more bread than formerly. Except at such great Ordinaries as Pontack's, where dinners ranged from four shillings a head to a guinea, it was possible to dine well for eighteenpence.‡ At a chop-house Swift got for tenpence gill-ale, bad broth, and three chops of mutton. At Spring Gardens the Burton Ale and hung-beef were famous.§ Lent was still generally observed; Swift's fare in that season was furmity and butter, and herb porridge. At Christmas, plum porridge, Christmas-pies, and brawn were essential items.

Provincial Life.

The number of social centres on the outskirts of London and in the country steadily increased. In 1716 Pope writes from Twickenham:—

"I have not dined but at great entertainments these ten days, in pleasant villas about the Thames, whose banks are now more populous than London, through the neighbourhood of Hampton Court."

* Ashton, i. 203–4. † Swift, ii. 50.

‡ Sir H. Walpole on his grandfather's account book, "Letters" ed. Cunningham, i.

§ *Spectator*, No. 83.

The interest in landscape-gardening made many find entertainment in their country houses who formerly came to town. They were busy with opening avenues, cutting glades, planting firs, contriving waterworks, making grottoes, thatched temples, shelleries, marine temples, and so forth. House-parties assembled, and stayed for months at a time. The idea of retiring into the country for the purpose of enjoying rustic surroundings had not yet become fashionable, owing to the difficulty of procuring provisions.* But the towns of Bath, Tunbridge, Epsom, and, at the close of the period, Cheltenham, were full of fashionable people.† In 1714 Pope writes from Bath: "My whole day is shared by the pump, assemblies, the walks, the chocolate-houses, raffling-shops, plays, medleys, etc." Its promenade he calls one of the finest in the world. Girls complained that the society there in 1740 was very dull, all the morning spent in "How d'ye does," all the afternoon in asking "What's trumps," and the ladies' sole talk in the Ladies' Coffee House was of gout, sciatica, and rheumatism. Mrs. Pendarves, in 1741, writes of fine ladies at Cheltenham, "where the sober and sedate are terrified at any extraordinary word or action." At the close of the period sea-bathing at Scarborough was in vogue. The "new-fashioned way of conversing by assemblies" increased the gaiety of provincial life. In nearly all large towns the assizes, races, or fairs were the occasion of assemblies, balls, card-parties, raffling-shops and plays.‡ Cambridge was old-fashioned, and had none of these things.

The gay Elizabeth Robinson, afterwards Mrs. Montagu, writes:—

"One visits in the country at the hazard of one's bones, but fear is never so powerful with me as to make me stay at home."

Roads.

In 1730 (November 21st), the king and queen, coming from Kew Gardens to St. James's, were overturned in their coach near Lord Peterborough's at Parson's Green, about 6 p.m., the wind having blown out the flambeaux so that the coachman could

* *Cf.* Pope's "Letters," 1739.

† *Universal Spectator*, May 6th, 1732; Chesterfield's "Letters," 1733.

‡ "Suffolk Correspondence," i. 256; Mrs. Montagu's and Mrs. Delany's "Letters," *passim*; Pennington's "Life of Elizabeth Carter," i. 27.

not see his way.* In many places in England, turnpike-riots had already begun in 1736.†

Coaches and Inns.

The well-to-do rode in the flying stages, and could do the journey from London to Exeter in three days, but poor travellers in the "stage-waggons" made very slow progress. No public conveyances travelled on Sundays, and in the North twenty-three miles a day was considered a fair rate of progress. Swift, creeping from Moor Park to Leicester in the waggon, slept at the penny hedge-inns, paying 6d. extra for clean sheets. Travellers with friends all over England expected hospitality at all great houses, even in the absence of the owner;‡ others less fortunate might lie

> "In the worst inn's worst room, with mat half-hung,
> The floor of plaster and the walls of dung;
> On once a flockbed, but repaired with straw,
> With tape-tied curtains never meant to draw." §

Dulness in the Country.

Giddy girls like Elizabeth Robinson "squalled for joy" when they were overturned in the coach, but the dulness of the country caused older members of the family to suffer from "hyp," "nerves," and "vapours."

All ladies who had London friends did their shopping by letter, and many packets of tea, chocolate, and plays were made up like those of Mrs. Pendarves for her sister in Gloucestershire. In exchange she received consignments of potted lampreys. All dress materials, even lawn for babies' nightcaps, were sent from town. "As for pins, I think you must pay the compliment to Gloucester of buying them there."

An Autobiography.

The delightful autobiography and letters of Mary Granville, by her first marriage Mrs. Pendarves, afterwards Mrs. Delany, give a vivid account both of country and town life seen from the point of view

* Hervey, "Memoirs," and *cf.* ii. 362 and ii. 101, on the impassableness of the roads that were not main roads to London; see also "Suffolk Correspondence," ii. 87 and i. 97, "cursed roads as all Cheshire is" (*sic*).

† *Ibid.*, ii. 311.

‡ "Suffolk Correspondence."

§ For an interesting list of inns and their merits on the road between London and Carlisle, 1719, see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1762, p. 600.

of a well-bred lady. She was educated at a school kept by a French mistress, and among her fellow-pupils she found the daughters of noblemen, brewers, and actresses. Returning to her country home, Buckland, near Broadway, Gloucestershire, she worked at her music, reading, writing, French, and needlework in the morning, joined her father, mother, and the minister of the parish at whist in the evening, or pursued her favourite cut-paper work, for which she became celebrated, while her father read aloud. Throughout her life she was always busily employed with whatever "fancy work" was fashionable, either making sets of chairs in tent-stitch, shell-flowers, featherwork, spinning wool, flax, and silk, netting, knotting (the queen's habitual employment), or the like. She describes the house as covered with laurel outside, and within furnished with home-spun stuff, and adorned with fine china and prints.

She soon found a suitor, one "whose understanding was not much improved, his education that of a country squire"; but his suit was not sanctioned by his parents, the match was broken off, and he soon after died of grief. To distract her mind she went to winter with her relations, Lord and Lady Lansdowne, who had just been released from two years' imprisonment in the Tower, and were living at their country-seat near Bath. Here as a girl of seventeen she met Alexander Pendarves, a man of sixty—fat, snuffy, dirty, ugly, gouty and sulky. She found "his large unwieldy person and his crimson countenance subjects of great mirth and observation," till she learned, to her horror, that "Gromio," as she called him, was the husband her relations had chosen for her. She perceived it to be her duty to obey those who wished to see her "settled in the world, to ease her friends of an expense and care," and accepted him as cheerfully as she could. After marriage she continued to find him a "person rather disgusting than engaging," but she heroically concealed her hatred of him, and was at the utmost pains to oblige him. After many "overturns" of the chaise on the Cornish roads, at the end of the wedding journey she reached his home—an old castle whose hall had no windows, the floor of the parlour was rotten, and the ceiling broken down; what windows it had were placed high above her head.

After two years of marriage Gromio began to drink deeply,

and when not suffering from gout was brought home drunk at 6 a.m. The young wife's life in London was no happier, for she was an appropriate victim for the attacks of gallants, and she "stuck close to her spinnet" for occupation, as she found the conduct of the men she met at assemblies a source of much annoyance.

A Circle of Friends.

During the period of her widowhood she spent much of her time with the Duchess of Portland, at Bulstrode, Bucks. The duchess had a gift for friendship, and gathered about her many bright, intelligent girls: a delightful correspondence passed between Pen (Mrs. Pendarves), Pip (her sister Anne), and Fidget (Elizabeth Robinson, afterwards Mrs. Montagu). Fidget had obtained an unusual amount of learning from Dr. Middleton at Cambridge, and the duchess and she read Cicero together.* Pen and Pip read the fashionable literature, the town lady giving advice to her country sister as to what books were worth buying and what were only worth hiring. It was the Duchess of Portland who rescued the learned Anglo-Saxon scholar, Elizabeth Elstob (p. 72), from penury, and made her governess to her children. In this position, though she found no scope for her extraordinary intellectual abilities, she was very happy, for she loved children.

Children.

It was no longer usual to administer corporal chastisement to children of the upper classes. An anecdote is told of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough's visit to the royal nursery, where she found the Princess (Queen Caroline) maintaining discipline. One of the children having been naughty, had just undergone wholesome correction after the German fashion, and was roaring piteously in consequence. The Duchess tried hard to console it. "Ay, see there!" cried the Prince, with an air of triumph, "you English are none of you well-bred, because you was not whipt when you was young." "Humph!" quoth her grace, "I thought to myself, I am sure *you* could not have been whipt when you were young, but I choked it in."†

Although children begin to play a larger part in the

* Writing of Mary Lepel (Lady Hervey) Chesterfield says, "She knows more than is necessary for any woman, for she understands Latin perfectly well, tho' she wisely conceals it."

† "Introd. Anecdotes," Lady M. W. Montague, p. 103.

correspondence of the period, and to take more share in their parents' lives than hitherto, aristocratic children were still left a great deal with servants, from whom they learned swearing and the singing of coarse ballads, while they played with their "babies" (dolls), "Dutch toys," and little "whirligigs."* The "Country Gentleman's Vademecum" (1717)† gives the annual expenses of a nobleman's family of from twenty-five to thirty people as £1,200-£1,500, the wages of twenty servants amounting only to £170. Defoe, in his "Everybody's Business Nobody's Business" (1725), complains bitterly of the scarcity of women servants, and of the enormous wages they were demanding—instead of 30s. or 40s. a year, they expect £6 or £8. He would like to see wages fixed at from £2 to £5, otherwise without a doubt they will soon be asking £20. Besides doubling her wages with vails, the cook gets the tradesman's poundage, so much in the pound for everything sent in to the house.

Servants.

The writer calling himself Don Manoel Gonzales described the servants as the plague of almost every house in town. He charged them with forming confederacies and contributing to the maintenance of each other when out of place.

When the country girl arrived in London, he says, she becomes a fine London Madam, and can drink tea and take snuff with the best. Indeed, she bargains for her tea twice a day before she takes a place.

The system of vails had passed into a by-word. After dining with a friend,

"you'll find all the servants drawn up in the passage like a file of musketeers, from the house steward down to the lowest livery servant, and each of them holds out his hand to you in as deliberate a manner as the servants in our inns on the like occasion."

The master of the house turns his head away, and pretends not to notice what is going forward.‡ The queen thought it necessary to give vails in town as well as in the country, but the king told her she was a fool to do so.§

Westminster, under Dr. Freind's rule, and Eton were the two most aristocratic schools. In 1728 Westminster had 434 boys, and the majority were

Education.

* Mrs. Montagu's "Correspondence," i., p. 33.

† By G. Jacob, quoted in Bülbring's edition of Defoe's "Compleat English Gentleman." ‡ Le Blanc, "Travels," p. 111. § Hervey, ii. 223.

of good family.* But the quality of public school education was much criticised.

Foreign Travel.

The renewal of peace restored to the eldest son of a wealthy family his privilege of three years' foreign travel, which was to supply all the defects in his education. Horace Walpole, at the age of twenty-two, went with a party of friends (1739) to Paris for two months, Rheims for three, then to Geneva, Turin, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Venice, from Genoa back to France by sea, and through the South of France to Orleans. France and Italy alone attracted the young travellers of the period. The love of making collections of curiosities led many "to view Italy knick-knackically," a danger against which Chesterfield warned his son. Lady M. W. Montague, travelling in France (1739), found English, Scotch, and Irish families settled in all the provincial towns; at Dijon she found sixteen English families of distinction.

Irregular Marriages.

The state of the marriage-law, together with their own want of sobriety, led many young men of good family to ruin their lives by unions hastily entered into, secretly and irregularly, at one of the many exempt churches and chapels where no licence, banns, or formalities of any kind were required. The expense and ceremony of regular marriages, the extreme severity of class distinctions and of family supervision over both sexes and at all ages, tended to encourage clandestine matches. Poor Mrs. Pendarves, after seven years of "Gromio" and twenty years of widowhood, was nearly prevented from marrying the learned Dr. Delany because her brother considered that the Delany family was beneath theirs, but his reluctant consent was ultimately given, and the marriage was happy.

Marriage Ceremonies.

Regular marriages were accompanied with all the ceremonies of a past age; in 1736, when Frederick Prince of Wales was married, the males of the royal family undressed the prince, and the princesses the bride. Being in bed in a rich undress, she was visited by her father-in-law, and then by the bridegroom, in a nightgown of silver stuff and cap of the finest lace. The court was next admitted to see the bride and bridegroom sitting up in bed surrounded by all the royal

* Wraxall, "Memoirs"; and Welch, "Alumni Westmonasterienses."

family.* At this point in most households there followed the ceremony of flinging the stocking, scrambling for garters, and the drinking of sack posset.†

Mourning.

The funeral ceremonies were also unchanged. Old Lady Bute is described as sitting up in a mourning-bed, the room lighted by one taper, all her grandchildren standing at the foot of the bed, while a continuous stream of visitors passed through the room in silence, as a complimentary condolence on the death of Lord Bute. Every part of the house that visitors saw was completely draped with black. A black coach was necessary during mourning, and the soles of the shoes were blacked.‡ The funeral generally took place at night, and the quality of the deceased was measured by the number of flambeaux. Each relative carried a bough, generally of rosemary, in one hand, and a link in the other, even when the funeral was by day. At the grave-side the boughs were thrown in and the flambeaux quenched in the soil. Gloves, scarves, and mourning rings were distributed to a wide circle of acquaintances.§

The law of Charles II. ordering all persons to be buried in woollen, for the encouragement of trade, was still in force, but the order was braved by some ladies, who were buried in Brussels lace "head," holland shift, with tucker and double ruffles, and new kid gloves.‖ Concerning mourning, Mrs. Pendarves writes from town to her sister three months after their father's death:—

"You should, if you keep strictly to the rules of mourning, wear your shammy gloves two months longer, but in the country, if it is more convenient to you, you may wear black silk; you might have worn black earrings and necklace these two months."

J. COLVILLE. Scotland.

THE Union, in completing the great organic change of the Revolution, presented many difficult political and social problems, the solution of which was left to the Scottish Whigs under Hanoverian rule. They were bitterly opposed by a Nationalist or

* Hervey, "Memoirs," i. 317; ii. 293.

† Misson, "Travels"; and Ashton, i. 40 *seqq.*

‡ Verney, "Papers," ii. 16. Pepys *passim*, Thoresby, i. 81; "Introductory Anecdotes," Lady M. W. Montague.

Jorevin, in Grose, p. 585. ‖ Ashton, "Queen Anne," i. p. 49, note.

Separatist party whose rallying cry was, Repeal of the Union. This, and not the cause of the exiled family, was the real *raison d'être* of the Jacobites. It was aided by a quasi-Cavalier reaction from the sterner discipline of the Revolution saints. The Tory reaction of 1710, both in its dealings with the Church and with the Highland chiefs, was skilfully designed to nurse the rising of the Fifteen. And when George I. began his reign by unceremoniously setting his face against the Tories and dismissing Mar from the Scotch Secretaryship, he supplied the Jacobites with a leader. But their cause was from the outset doomed to failure. The Treaty of Utrecht, and the sudden deaths of Anne and Louis XIV., all worked powerfully in favour of the Hanoverian. Sheriffmuir proved only a meaner Killiecrankie, and the incapable leader that dared to provoke it missed the death that glorified his model, Dundee, and got off too easily with ignoble exile. Argyll, a general of the school of Marlborough and Stair, was, in integrity, patriotism, and military skill, a striking contrast to the Jacobite leader whom he defeated. Thanks to him, the triumph of the Government was complete, in spite of its own gross remissness. Sheriffmuir, Preston, and the recapture of Inverness all took place on one and the same day. The rising had no hold whatever on the people. Even Mar's own tenantry refused to join him. One can understand the Camerons, Macdonalds, and Mackenzies rallying from their lawless glens to the *tinchell*, or deer-hunt, on the Braes of Mar, at the call of an intriguing chief, but it is difficult to conceive why the great lowland lords—Keith-Marischal, Panmure, Southesk, Seton, Kenmure, Maxwell—imperilled their lives and their broad acres and rich rent-rolls for a worthless cause. Under better auspices they would have found a salve for their outraged Nationalist sympathies, and an outlet for their talents, in the warfare of Parliamentary opposition. The Government had no sooner got the Fifteen over than they put things in train for the Forty-five. Walpole, becoming all-powerful after 1719, reinstated Argyll, whom George I. had some time before ungratefully dismissed, and for years he or his brother, Lord Ilay, was virtually viceroy in Scotland. But the suppression of the rebellion left bitter memories in the promiscuous hanging of

Political History.

The Rebellion of 1715.

simple peasants after Preston, the deporting of crowds to the plantations, the assizes at Carlisle, the ignominy of marching well-born captives through London streets, and the beheadings on Tower Hill. The rebellion of 1715 ruined about fifty of the best families of the country, whose forfeited estates were entrusted to a commission of six sitting in Edinburgh, of whom four were English, Sir Richard Steele being one. The forced sales, under an Act drawn up by English lawyers, as usual oblivious of conditions prevailing outside their own ken, met with such tedious and expensive opposition that after four years the costs almost entirely swallowed up the proceeds. In 1719 an Assets Company—for the Joint Stock craze was in full swing—took over the forfeited properties, the surplus profits to be devoted to the improvement of the country. This Company was developed out of the Yorks Building Company, originally formed (1675) to supply water to Piccadilly and St. James' Fields. The name was from the old town house of the see of York, on a site immediately east of Charing Cross. The Company dismantled many beautiful historic mansions like Seton and Leuchars Castles, introduced a few industries to a languid existence, and filled the pockets of Edinburgh lawyers by means of a rich crop of litigation.

The Confiscations and their Economic Effect.

The Government was an unpopular system of corruption and repression. The spoils of office and parliamentary representation were in the hands of Ilay or his brother, Argyll. Robert Dundas, writing to his son, says, "I can write you nothing in the way of news, all our letters being opened in the old way." Lord Advocate Craigie secured the Sutherland burghs through the ducal interest. His constituents were five delegates from the burghs, and his agent in Dingwall assured him that there was no argument there more powerful than brandy and claret. Robertson of Ochtertyre tells us there was but one disputed election in Perth during George III.'s reign. The result was a strong independent Whig opposition, which Walpole's fiscal proposals made doubly unpopular. The rallying-cry was that of the Jacobites in Kelso market-place—"No union, no malt tax, no salt tax." The malt tax had been extended to Scotland in 1713, but not enforced till 1724, when even the Lord Advocate and the Secretary of State opposed it. Both

Riots.

were dismissed from office. The obnoxious exciseman was to come now nearer than ever to men's business and bosoms. In Glasgow, Campbell of Shawfield was specially unpopular for his support of Ilay in securing the tax. The mob sacked his town house (1725) in the Saltmarket. The riot was suppressed by the troops of Wade, not without bloodshed. It foreshadowed the better known Porteous riot of 1736, of some of the incidents of which Alexander Carlyle, then a student in Edinburgh, gives a graphic account.

Rise of Dissent.

In default of popular representation in Parliament, a good substitute was found in the annual Assembly of the Kirk, where were fought out the battles of the Argathelian, or Argyll party, and the Squadrone, or independent Whig opposition, who detested Walpole and repression. The toleration of Episcopacy and the odious Abjuration Oath sowed the seeds of dissension, for they brought the Church into conflict with that fertile stirrer up of trouble, the Cæsar of the State. The immediate result was the Reformed or Cameronian Church, the hero of which was Macmillan, minister of Balmaghie, in Kirkcudbright. The dramatic scene of the inauguration of the movement was a green knoll above Douglas in that upper Ward of Lanarkshire, whose bleak moors were full of memories of the Persecution. The restoration of lay patronage about the same time was also a fruitful source of heart-burning, and produced the Original Secession of 1733, under the leadership of Ebenezer Erskine. The real cause of this movement, however, was a more searching schism now developing itself within the Church itself, and precisely analagous to the rise of Methodism in England. Whitefield, indeed, on his visit to Scotland in 1741, fraternised with Erskine, and took part in the great open-air revival of the following year, known as the Cambuslang Wark. The two parties now arising—the Moderates and the Evangelicals, or High Flyers—revealed a characteristic feature of Scottish Dissent. Seceders always hived off as a protest against the innovating party of progress, declaring that, as true conservatives, they took with them the essential virtues of the Reformation. They felt themselves called upon to testify against the lukewarm indifference and backslidings of the Moderates. The Moderates had a majority of wealth and talent, yet Dissent never coincided with a cleavage of the

classes of society, as has been so largely the case in England. Alongside the Church still existed the rival Scotch and English Episcopalians. The former were non-juring to a man, and after the Fifteen their clergy suffered much. Burt says that, one Sunday morning, when King George was prayed for, the congregation rose up as one man and set about some such trivial action as snuffing. "*There was not a single response but our own*, for the ritual was of the baldest."

Religion in the Rural Districts.

In the remoter Highland districts the Presbyterian clergy met with the greatest opposition. Æneas Sage, in the new parish of Loch Carron (1726), found modes of worship allied to Paganism, and the people so opposed to him as to try to set fire to the barn in which he lived. English observers, however, report that the Presbyterian clergy led regular and blameless lives, and were more reverenced than those in England. They preached in neckcloths and coloured cloaks, this being the rule, except in the case of a professor of divinity, or one remarkable for age or gravity. "The Book of Common Order," says Calamy, "is now out of sight, and the devotions are often wild, incoherent, and extemporary." Extempore prayers produced much unseemly familiarity. During an unusually dry summer the minister of Leswalt in Wigtown had got into the habit of praying for rain, but one Sunday a farmer rushed up to him on entering the church, saying, "At your leisure, sir, wi' your refreshing showers. The hay o' Balquhirry is no a' gotten in yet." But there was no doubt that the Church all through this time kept a firm hold on social life. A grave decorum marked even the week-days. Elizabeth Mure (born 1714) says that in her youth all the respectable kept the evangelical creed, going regularly to church on Sunday and observing daily family worship. "While reverence and awe remained for masters, fathers, and heads of clans, it was then that the awe and dread of Deity was most powerful." Piety was sincere, though we may well believe it to be exaggerated. On the other hand, there were atheistical clubs in the capital—such as the Hell Fire, the Sulphur Society, the Demirep Dragoons. The Government issued edicts against them, probably because they were supported by Jacobite roysterers. Their existence makes us believe in what Elizabeth Mure says :—"The fear of

Hell and the deceitful power of the Devil was at the bottom of all their religious sentiments." It was indeed an age of striking contrasts.

Condition of the Country.

The third decade of the century seems to have been the period when the Lowland gentry woke up from the sleep of ages, and were seized with that spirit of rural improvement which in time transformed the face of the country. The return of the exiles from their long sojourn in Holland and the increased intercourse with England led to a general elevation of the standard of living. The effects were first noticed in the Lothians, where the building of mansions, formation of parks and gardens, planting of ornamental woods, reclamation of waste lands, all marked a distinctly higher civilisation. The lawyers of Edinburgh and the new official class generally largely benefited by the Union, and soon began to supplant the old territorial magnates and import a higher intelligence into the management of land. Hence from this period date those beautiful *plesaunces* in the Lothians which charmed travellers like Macky and Defoe. Even to far distant Moray we find a Quaker gardener at Holyrood sending (1718) a most extensive assortment of the seeds of useful and ornamental shrubs and trees, and all the garden stuffs grown at the present day. The Queen Anne fashion of grottoes, too, spread northwards along with those *wildernesses* in which art improved upon nature. These lairds, too, attacked the farming customs that had been unchanged for centuries. The Society of Improvers in Agriculture began operations in 1723, leasing an extensive morass in what is now the Meadows or south side of Edinburgh for experiments. They recommended fallowing, draining, liming, and enclosing, but the greatest revolution was effected by the introduction of clover and sown grasses, thus making it possible to dispense with staff-herding and save stock from the semi-starvation of winter. Lord Belhaven's "Countryman's Rudiments" (1726) describes the existing condition of East Lothian as primitive in the extreme, a condition which was to last a long time yet among the peasant farmers, who looked upon improvements as only for lairds with pet notions in their heads. The first note of the social bearings of coming agrarian change is the Galloway Enclosure Riots of 1723. The landlords, anxious to

rear cattle for the southern markets, turned out many of the poor tenants from their holdings. Two troops of dragoons from Edinburgh broke up the bands of Levellers and Houghers, and widespread distress followed, aggravated by the losses of the Mississippi and South Sea schemes. The real obstacle to improvement was the survival of the feudal system of land tenures, which, by exacting rents in kind from tenants-at-will, made landlords unprogressive and peasants thriftless.

In spite of all this, however, real progress was made, at least in the Lowlands, where we hear of two novelties destined to increase enormously the general happiness. For ages the "knockin stane" had been found at every cottage door. In this the husks of the barley had to be beaten off with a mallet to prepare it for the *kail* (vegetable broth), which formed the universal midday meal. Andrew Fletcher, however, brought from Holland, at great pains and even risk, the pot-barley mill, and erected it at Saltoun, in East Lothian. During most of the century the Saltoun mills supplied the whole country with pot-barley. Of greater moment was the introduction of the potato from Ireland. During the first quarter of the century potatoes are occasionally mentioned as a rarity. In 1739 they were first planted in the open field near Kilsyth by Graham of Tamrawer. A pedlar, Henry Prentice, introduced them into the Lothians shortly afterwards, where they were pretty general by 1760.

The Highlands.

This period is noticeable for the first serious attempts to deal with the Highland question. The wolf was not long extinct in the mountains, Ewen Cameron of Lochiel having killed the last in 1680. James VI. had tried to restrain the chiefs by keeping their children in the Lowlands, where they were educated. The Church after the Revolution followed with a scheme for introducing schools into the Highlands, where the peasantry had been kept in dense ignorance. On the other hand, it is difficult to reconcile the dignity and refinement of the gentry with their lawless and semi-savage practices. Tutors from the south were to be found in the houses even of the lesser gentry or tacksmen. Honest labour, the while, was despised, and plundering deemed only an exciting sport. Specially after the Fifteen lawlessness was at its worst. A *creagh*, or cattle raid, was too often popular, above all if at the expense of the peaceful tenants of the

great Whig lords, Montrose in the Lennox, and the fertile lands of Moray and Ross. The Independent Companies of loyal clans were tried, but disbanded in 1717 under the Disarming Act. An armed police was then formed under loyal leaders, and these, being clad in the dark native tartan, were called Reicudan Dhu, or Black Watch, in contrast to the Sidier Roy (red), or regular soldiers, who had been placed as garrisons in the worst districts, such as Fort Augustus (1717), Ruthven in Badenoch, and Glenelg on the Sound of Sleat (1726). From the native companies was formed the famous Black Watch, or 42nd regiment, first enrolled at Aberfeldy in 1740. In all these matters the government was mainly guided by Lord-Advocate Forbes of Culloden. Had his further advice been taken of recruiting Highlanders for service with the army abroad, afterwards put in force by Chatham, it would have made the Forty-five impossible. The most effective mode of reducing disorder, however, was Wade's Roads (1726-37). Travelling all over the country was then a matter of supreme difficulty. Two Glasgow merchants, going on horseback to London in 1739, found no turnpike till they came to Grantham, 110 miles from the capital. To that point they travelled on a narrow causeway with an unmade soft road on each side. They passed great strings of packhorses on the way. Steele, going to Scotland, hired a Frenchman to teach him French by the way. Wade connected Crieff and Perth with Fort Augustus and Inverness by two main roads, which, however, crossed the Grampians as one from Dalnacardoch to Dalwhinnie. A continuation of the system connected Inverness, Fort Augustus and Fort William, passing down Glenmore. Wade constructed in all 250 miles of road 16 ft. wide, erected good huts along the route, and built 40 bridges, the finest of which was at Aberfeldy, on the model of Stirling Bridge. The work employed in summer 500 soldiers. As engineer officer under him Wade had Burt, the writer of those "Letters from the Highlands" which present such an admirable picture of the social condition of the country at the time.*

* Burt regarded Highland scenery with horror, which is at least more tolerable than Samuel Johnson's contempt. He tells how some brother officers had the courage to ascend Ben Nevis. This, with Brodie's account in a letter to Wodrow (1702), must surely be the earliest record of mountaineering in the island. These were not the days for any appreciation of hill scenery. Of the Highland hills, Burt says, "The whole appear of a dismal gloomy

The remarkable rise of Glasgow after the Union marks a new departure. Trade began on a small scale in sugar, herring, coarse woollens, and a little tobacco, carried on in ships hired from Whitehaven. Goods, brought up the shallow river in lighters, or *gabars*, were conveyed mostly to Bo'ness on Forth by horse pack. In this way, as the trade grew, the Continent was mainly supplied with tobacco through the Virginia Dons, as the Glasgow merchants were called. This trade became so formidable, that we find Bristol and Liverpool petitioning Parliament (1721) with the view of crushing it. Not till 1718, however, had Glasgow ships of her own crossing the Atlantic. The young Scots factors, generally of good family, engaged in this trade, did much to open up the colonies in the West. Manufactures developed in connection with trade, and looms were set agoing after 1725 for linen. An Act, passed in 1727, to encourage manufactures and fisheries, caused the exports to rise rapidly, especially of linens. About the same time the thread industry of Paisley took its rise. Christian Shaw, daughter of the laird of Bargarran near by, and chief agent in the burning of the witches at Paisley, developed uncommon talent in spinning and bleaching linen thread, for which Lady Blantyre found a ready market among the lace-makers of Bath. One of the family, while in Holland, learned the secrets of the industry, and thus further contributed to make Bargarran thread famous all over the country. Here and in Glasgow, too, long flourished *inkle*, or linen-tape making, another capture from Holland, Alex. Harvie having succeeded at great risk in smuggling two looms and a workman out of Haarlem. Another romance of industry is recorded on a tombstone in the village of Dunlop, telling how Barbara Gilmour, driven with her goodman to Ireland in "the dark and drublie dayes of Charles II.," there learned the making of sweet milk cheese, and on her return in better times introduced dairying into Ayrshire. To the family of Duncan Forbes, who did so much for Scottish trade, we owe the rise of what is now a great national industry. Their estates near Inverness having been much wasted during the Revolution

Trade and Manufactures.

brown, drawing upon a dirty purple, and most of all disagreeable when the heath is in bloom. They show rugged, irregular lines against the sky-line extremely harsh to the eye."

troubles that closed with Killiecrankie, the family obtained the privilege of distilling whisky from grain raised on their lands of Ferintosh, in Ross-shire, on payment of a small composition in lieu of excise. Ferintosh was for long a synonym for whisky. The Yorks Company made many attempts to develop the native resources. On the Grant estates their agent, the notorious Aaron Hill, tried (1728) on a wasteful scale to turn the vast fir-forests of Speyside to some account. Here he introduced rafting instead of the primitive custom he found in use of guiding the trees down stream in coracles.* For centuries the east coast of Scotland had supplied the Low Countries with fish. The trade was entirely in the hands of the Dutch, greatly to the annoyance of Scottish patriots. To the Great Fishing, as it was called, came hundreds of Dutch busses in the summer months. In one summer 2,000 had been seen at one time in Bressay Sound. They drove a great trade in bartering goods for fish, stockings, and food products. Till 1806 Dutch and Danish coins were commoner than British in Lerwick. Not till 1826 was there any quantity of fish cured by the Shetlanders for export.

Social Life.

All that was characteristic and picturesque in the age we find concentrated in the social life of the capital. Fortunately, we have a parallel to Pope and the *Spectator* in Allan Ramsay, who came to Edinburgh in 1701, and died there in 1758. His inauguration of the "Easy Club" (1712) marked the introduction into exclusive Jacobite society of this poetic bookseller and pushing eupeptic bourgeois. The "Evergreen" (1724) led directly to the great revival of Scottish literature, and indirectly to the whole Romantic movement. Though Ramsay was lost in admiration of Pope and Steele and Gay, he had good sense and natural instincts enough to appreciate the remains of what the Correct School called a barbarous age. The "Gentle Shepherd," which immediately followed (1725), is the happiest compromise of the day between the "vulgar" and the "genteel," and a delightful picture of rural manners. In his shop, at the east end of the Luckenbooths, where he looked out upon the Cross and the noisy High Street, he laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of Old Edinburgh, and brightened the

* Of hides over a wicker framework. They were in use on the Spey till the end of the eighteenth century.

life of that *dour* time in its convivial clubs, outdoor sports and attractions of music and the stage. In the tortuous steep street, the West Bow, headquarters of the Bowhead Saints and "Tinkler Billies," whom Robert Ferguson has celebrated, the first assembly for dancing was established, about 1710, and here it continued till 1746. A letter from a lady in Donibristle, seat of the Earl of Moray, nestling pleasantly among the Aberdour woods on Forth, to her friend in Morayshire, gives an interesting note of such festivities. "Every Thursday," the writer says, "there is a meeting for dancing, at 4 p.m. The ticket is half-a-crown, and you pay for tea, coffee, or chocolate and biscuit. The manageresses are Countess Panmure, Lady Newhall, etc. The clergy are preaching against it." The teaching of dancing soon followed. In 1728 the Lovers of Music formed a society for weekly concerts in the evenings, and two years later Craig made a collection of Scotch tunes for harp and spinet, the first of its kind. But it was in connection with the stage that the most daring advances were made. Here Allan Ramsay met with opposition akin to the Puritan hostility to Shakespeare. Under his auspices the first regular company, Tony Aston's, played (1725-6) such pieces as *The Mourning Bride* and *The Beggar's Opera*. Wodrow writes with horror of Aston's stage as "a dreadful corrupter of our youth and an eyelet to prodigality and vanity." In 1736 Allan himself opened the New Theatre in Carubber's Close, but was met with an old Act against rogues and vagabonds, and had to close, after a heavy loss. Out of doors, the sports that live in Allan's verses show that to the citizen there was sometimes light and leisure. On the still open ground of Kirk o' Field, to the south of the city, there were numerous bowling-greens. Near by archery was practised in the Meadows; farther off there was golf, on Bruntsfield, and tennis, near Holyrood, while there was always that Greenwich Park of the north, Leith Links and Sands for golf, horse-racing and popular carnivals. A spirit of civic improvement, too, was abroad, of which the chief fruit was the building of the Royal Infirmary, begun in 1735; and with it grew up the medical fame of the city under Alexander Monro, who had opened a class for anatomy in 1720. The moving spirit in these improvements was George Drummond, thrice Lord Provost. His

name is best known in connection with the New Town, of which we have the first distinct conception from the Earl of Mar, who, about 1715, drew up an interesting scheme of improvements, many of which were adopted by Drummond.

Culture.

The age was favourable to individuality and odd contrasts, for neither education, reading, nor travel had as yet done much to produce uniformity. The upper classes were seeking for something better than the coarse manners of the old grammar schools, for we note about this time the rise of provincial boarding-schools, such as that Scotch Eton at Dalkeith, where the first President Dundas had his boys, an example followed by many more of the gentry of the Lothians. There was much indeed to brutalise the young. The Candlemas cockfights at schools were honoured institutions. The coarse treatment of habitual offenders by ducking, scourging and brandings, the frequent hangings, all these tended in the same direction. The grammar school of Aberdeen, to its credit, was now making special efforts, by janitors and censors, to improve the minor morals of the scholars. But the most significant note of all was the new demand for female education. In the universities the old tutorial system of regenting had quite given place to the professorial system under which each teacher lectured upon his own special subject. A succession of brilliant men, like the Monros, Gregorys, and Maclaurin, gave to Edinburgh great repute in medicine and science. Law and the Church formed the only careers open to young men of talent. Not till Chatham's days did Scots abroad find scope for their talents in war and colonising; so now we find them in the schools of Leyden and Utrecht, thereafter making fame and fortune at the Bar at home, buying estates, becoming improvers, and giving a refined flavour to the Jacobite society of the capital. After the Revolution, William's policy of absorbing into the Church the illiterate curates of the North is said to have lowered the tone of the clergy. Licentiates found employment as tutors and chaplains in manor-houses, where they often met with as little respect as the Levite of Queen Anne's days. On the skirts of the learned class hung the poor scribe, who greeted every event of unusual domestic interest with his poetic effusions. The first catalogue of the Advocates' Library, founded in 1682, by Sir

George Mackenzie, appeared in 1742, and showed a collection of 40,000 volumes. Popular reading got its first impetus from Allan Ramsay, who has the credit of beginning a circulating library, in 1728. The *Scots' Magazine*, modelled on the *Gentleman's*, made its appearance in 1739. For some time after the Union Edinburgh had three newspapers, of which the *Courant* was Whig and the *Caledonian Mercury* Jacobite. Besides these, news-letters, such as the *Flying Post* and the *Gazette*, found their way to remote country houses. Correspondence was carried on under considerable difficulty. Burt had to spare the names of particular persons, his foot-runner being liable to be intercepted by, apparently, Breadalbane, as he darkly hints. And when the messenger reached town he had to trust to those *serviceable vagabonds*, the caddies, for delivery, when addresses were like these :—" Mr. Arch. Dunbar of Thunderton to be left at Capt. Dunbar's writing chamber at the Iron revell 3rd story below the Cross and north end of the Close at Edinburgh " ; or, again, " Capt. Philip Anster of Newgrange at his lodging a little above the Fortune Well, south side of the street, Edinburgh." Printing had long been in a low state, due to the pernicious monopoly granted to one Anderson, a relic of the bad days of the Restoration. But William Ged, an Edinburgh goldsmith, worked as early as 1725 at stereotyping, and in a tall land on the south side of the High Street produced an edition of Sallust in 1736, the first example of the art. By 1740 Wilson, a professor of astronomy at Glasgow, had produced the first types north of the Tweed, and with his help the brothers Foulis, of Glasgow, brought out eighteen editions of the classics between 1741 and 1747. Within this period falls the last case of witch-burning, that of a poor woman at Dornoch, in Sutherland (1727), and in 1736 the Act against witches, which had been silently growing effete, was repealed. The Associate Synod of 1742 testified against this proceeding as a symptom of latitudinarianism.

P. W. JOYCE. Ireland.

THE repressive legislation against Ireland which followed the revolution (IV., pp. 618-621), had produced the natural results, and at the opening of the present period the country was in a most deplorable state. The Catholics were crushed by the

enactments specially aimed at them; and Catholics and Protestants alike were impoverished by the destruction of trade. There was little business of any kind, and the working classes starved for want of employment. The hostile attitude of the English Government produced, among other evils, the same result as in old times (III., pp. 299, 300): a feeling of distrust and aversion; and the Protestant people, seeing their rights as citizens unjustly curtailed, and themselves in consequence reduced to poverty, were even more bitterly hostile and disaffected than the Catholics, who, at this time, scarcely expected anything more than the right to live. As a body the Irish Parliament shared in the general discontent; but it was powerless to stem the tide of ruin. Some years before (in 1703) the Parliament, fearing that the continued selfish jealousy of English traders might lead to further destructive legislation against Ireland, had petitioned for parliamentary union with England, hoping to fare better if they had a voice in the English Legislature; but the petition was rejected. But soon after the opening of the present period there was further cause for exasperation. In a dispute about some property between two Irish litigants—commonly known as the "Annesley Case"—the English House of Lords, on being appealed to, reversed the decision of the Irish Lords, who, however, attempted to enforce their own decision; whereupon the English Parliament ended the dispute by passing, in 1719, a momentous Act, known as the "Sixth of George I.," depriving the Irish Lords of the right to hear appeals, and deciding that the English Parliament had the right to make laws for Ireland. This last right, which, it may be observed, was not included in Poynings' Law, was now asserted for the first time.

"The Sixth of George I."

But there were many thoughtful and just-minded Protestant Irishmen who bitterly resented the subjection of their Parliament and the destruction of their rising trade; and from time to time there was serious resistance both in and out of Parliament. Many years before (in 1698) William Molyneux, one of the members for the University of Dublin, denounced with great ability the commercial injustice done to Ireland, and asserted the absolute independence of the Irish Parliament and its exclusive right to make laws for Ireland;

which pronouncement excited such rage in England that, by order of the authorities there, his pamphlet was publicly burned by the hangman. But by far the ablest of the Irishmen who in those times stood up in defence of their country was Jonathan Swift, the celebrated Dean of St. Patrick's in Dublin. In 1723 the English Treasury, without consulting the Irish Parliament, granted to one William Wood, an Englishman (p. 115), a patent to coin £108,000 in debased halfpence and farthings for circulation in Ireland, which would put £40,000 into the pockets of Wood and the king's favourite, the Duchess of Kendal. This attempt at a gross job was resisted with the utmost indignation in Ireland by all classes, from the Houses of Parliament down; notwithstanding which it would probably have succeeded but for Swift. His "Drapier's Letters," written in simple, homely, vigorous language, excited the country to such a pitch that the patent for "Wood's Halfpence" had to be withdrawn.

Molyneux and Swift.

About this time the then Primate, Hugh Boulter, who, from being the king's chaplain had been promoted to the archbishopric of Armagh, was intrusted with the chief management of the English interests in Ireland. He was bitterly hostile to the Roman Catholics, but was otherwise a good man. It was chiefly through his influence that the Catholics were disfranchised (IV., p. 620). Finding his efforts to induce the Catholics to conform unavailing, he tried another device. In 1730, he induced the Government to found the "Charter Schools," for educating poor Roman Catholic children in the Protestant faith; but these schools, though long maintained and subsidised by the Government, effected very little.

Primate Boulter.

AUTHORITIES.—1715-1742.

GENERAL HISTORY.

Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century;* Lord Mahon, *History of England*, 1713-83; Hearn, *The English Constitution;* Dicey, *Law and Custom of the Constitution;* Morley, *Walpole.* On foreign affairs in particular: Coxe, *History of the Bourbons in Spain* and *History of the House of Austria;* Wiesener, *Le Régent, l'Abbé Dubois, et les Anglais;* Aubertin, *L'Esprit Public au XVIIIme. Siècle;* Jobez, *La France sous Louis XV.;* Armstrong, *Elizabeth Farnese:* Seeley, *Expansion of England.*.

SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

Military History.—Wright, *Life of Wolfe;* Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe;* Innes, *Britain and her Rivals;* Stedman, *History of the American War;* Bancroft,

History of the United States; Capt. J. Knox, *Historical Journal of the Campaign in North America*, 1757-60 [London, 1869; he served under Wolfe].

The Navy.—Charnock, *Naval Architecture* and *Biographia Navalis;* Derrick, *Memoirs of the Royal Navy;* Campbell, *Lives of the Admirals;* J. Cowley, *Sailor's Companion* (1740); Blanckley, *Naval Expositor* (1750); Falconer, *Marine Dictionary;* *The Historical Register*, and the *Naval Histories* of Burchett, Lediard, and Schomberg.

Exploration.—See list appended to c. xix.

Law, 1688-1742.—The text of the statutes cited; Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England;* Fitzjames Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law of England;* Copinger, *The Law of Copyright;* Morris, *A Summary of the Law of Land and Mortgage Registration*, and the authorities therein enumerated.

Science and Philosophy.—Whewell, *History and Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences; Encyclopædia Britannica*, articles "Chemistry" and "Electricity"; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy;* Erdmann, *History of Philosophy;* Leslie Stephen, *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century;* and the works of the philosophers mentioned. On Berkeley and Hume, see the introductions by T. H. Green to his ed. of Hume's works.

Medicine and Public Health.—Sidney Young, *Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (1890); South, *Memorials of the Craft of Surgery*, ed. by D'Arcy Power, M.A.; C. Creighton, *History of Epidemics in Britain;* Glaister, *Dr. William Smellie and his Contemporaries* (Glasgow, 1893); Mather, *Two Great Scotsmen* (William and John Hunter) (Glasgow, 1894); R. H. Semple, *Memoirs of the Botanic Gardens at Chelsea belonging to the Society of Apothecaries of London* (1878); Wilks and Bettany, *Biographical History of Guy's Hospital;* Dr. T. F. Payne, *Address on Epidemiology in England* and *Introduction* to the reprint of William Boghurst's *Loimographia: an account of the Great Plague of London*, in *Transactions of the Epidemiological Society of London*, New Series, vol. xiii. (1894).

English Scholarship, 1570-1742.—A sketch of the general history of classical scholarship, divided into periods with the names of the leading representatives of various nations in each, is given by Urlichs in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, i, 39-126*b* (1886). Incidental criticisms on the works of English scholars are included in Hallam's *Literature of Europe;* biographical details, in the current dictionaries, and (for part of this period) in Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century;* lists of published works, with dates, in Freund's *Triennium Philologicum*, i., pp. 21-112 (1874), and Pökel's *Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexikon* (1882). On Bentley, apart from his own works and his correspondence, published by Burney (1817), Friedemann (1825), C. Wordsworth (1842), and others, the principal authorities are the *Life* by Bishop Monk (ed. 2, 1833); *Richard Bentley* by J. Mähly (1868), and Professor Jebb's biography in *English Men of Letters* (1882). There are notices of Bentley, Markland, Taylor, Toup and Tyrwhitt in F. A. Wolf's *Analecten* (1817-20), reprinted in Wolf's *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Bernhardy (1869); and a paper on Dawes by Mr. Giles in the *Emmanuel College Magazine*, vol. v., pp. 49-69. On the study of Anglo-Saxon towards the end of the seventeenth and during the early part of the eighteenth century, the best sketch is that of Kemble in Francisque Michel's *Bibliothèque Anglo-Saxonne* (Paris and London, 1837).

Literature and *Art.*—See list appended to c. xviii.

Handel and English Music.—J. C. Smith, *Anecdotes of Handel;* R. Clark, *Reminiscences of Handel;* *Lives* of Handel by Schölcher, W. S. Rockstro, Chrysander, and Bray: article, "Handel," in Sir G. Grove's *Dictionary of Music:* article, "Handel: Man and Musician," in *Blackwood's Magazine* (1894).

Agriculture, 1715-1815.—Jethro Tull, *New Horse-hoeing Husbandry* (1733); Dr. E. Rigby, *Holkham: its Agriculture* (1818); *Journals of the Royal Agricultural Society*, vols. iii.-vi., viii., xvi., xvii., xxiii.; Arthur Young, *Tours* (1768-80) and *Travels in France* (1794); also his *Farmer's Letters to the People of England* (1768-71), *Rural Economy* (1770), *Political Arithmetic* (1774); *Husbandry of Three Celebrated English Farmers* (Bakewell, Arbuthnot, and Ducket) (1811); Marshall,

Rural Economy of Norfolk (1787); *of Yorkshire* (1788); *of Gloucestershire* (1789); *of the Midland Counties* (1790); *of the West* (1796); *of the South* (1798); and the *Agricultural Surveys of Great Britain and Ireland* (1793-96 and 1804-13).

Manufacture and Mining.—On Silk Weaving, see Rees, *Encyclopædia*, article "Silk"; *Dictionary of National Biography*, article "Lombe"; *Tracts Relating to Trade*, in the British Museum (pressmark 816 m. 12, and subsequent vols.); J. Apletre, *Proposals for an Undertaking to Produce Raw Silk.* On Wool: J. Bischoff, *History of the Woollen and Worsted Manufacture*; W. Haynes, *Great Britain's Glory.* On Ceramics and Glass: F. Haudicquer de Blancourt, *Art of Glass*; and numerous tracts. On Iron: H. Scrivenor, *History of the Iron Trade*; J. Percy, *Iron and Steel*; *Dict. of National Biography*, article "Darby"; and tracts.

Finance, etc.—Modern Works: Lord Mahon's and Lecky's histories (see above); Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*; Rogers, *Economic Interpretation of History*; Dowell, *History of Taxes and Taxation. Contemporary Authorities:* Hervey, *Memoirs* (best account of Walpole's Excise Scheme); Horace Walpole, *Reminiscences*, *Memoirs*, and *Letters*; Defoe on *Loans* (Somers Tracts); Anderson, *History of Commerce* (for South Sea Scheme); original documents in Coxe, *Walpole.*

Pauperism and Labour.—Burn, *History of the Poor Laws*, is the best book up to the date he wrote (1764); thence to 1796 Eden's great work, which also gives documents for the earlier period. For the condition of the various classes and districts, see Defoe's *Tour* (1724), supplemented by Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, Horace Walpole, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, with the Parliamentary Debates. Modern books: Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce*; W. C. Sydney, *England in the 18th Century*; Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, and *The Economic Interpretation of History*; Lecky, *History of England*; and Webb, *Trades Unions.*

Social Life.—The Court: John, Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Court of George II.* (ed. Croker); Jesse, *Memoirs of the Courts of England*; Walpole, *Reminiscences*; Stone, *Chronicles of Fashion. London:* Fielding, *Covent Garden Journal*; Timbs, *Club Life*; works entitled *London*, by Malcolm, Dr. Doran and Jesse. *Bath:* Goldsmith, *Beau Nash*; Peach, *Ralph Allen*; *Historic Houses in Bath*; *Tours*, by Defoe and Macky. *Post:* Malet, *Annals of the Road*; Peach, *Ralph Allen. General:* the works of Pope, Gay, Swift, Defoe, and Fielding; the *Gentleman's Magazine*; Andrews, *Eighteenth Century*; Miller, *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*; John Chamberlayne, *Present State of England* (1748); Angeloni, *Letters on the English* (1755); Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*; and various collections of correspondence, *e.g.* the *Letterbook of Lord Hervey*, *First Earl of Bristol*; *Letters* of Horace Walpole (ed. Peter Cunningham); of Lady Mary Lepel Hervey (ed. T. W. Croker); of Swift; Lady Suffolk; Mrs. Montagu; Lord Chesterfield; Mrs. Delany; Pennington, *Elizabeth Carter.*

Scotland, 1714-42.—Burt, *Letters* (Jamieson's ed. has the Gartmore MSS., 1747); Hill Burton, *Lives* of Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, and of Duncan Forbes; Crawford, *Renfrewshire*; Hamilton, *Sheriffdom of Lanark* (1710); *Reminiscences* of Maxwell of Mumbles (new *Statistical Account of Scotland*, vol. iv.); Lord Belhaven, *Countryman's Rudiments* (1723); Gordon, *Northern Itinerary* (1726); Murray, *Yorks Building Company* (1883); Ker of Kersland, *Secret Services* (1726-7); Prof. Story, *Memoirs of Robert Story* (1725-50); Erskine (Lord Prestongrange), *Diary of a Senator in the College of Justice* (1717-8); President Forbes, *Report on a Visit to the West Highlands* (1737) (App. Crofters' Commission Report, 1884); Burgh Records of Aberdeen, Stirling, Prestwick. *Social Life:* Allan Ramsay's Poems; Dunbar, *Social Life in Moray*; Scott, *Heart of Midlothian.*

Ireland.—See list appended to c. xix.

CHAPTER XVIII.

AN ERA OF NEW DEPARTURES. 1742-1784.

On Walpole's resignation Lord Wilmington (Sir Spencer Compton) became First Lord of the Treasury, Sandys Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Carteret succeeded Harrington as one of the Secretaries of State. The other Secretary, Newcastle, with Henry Pelham, Hardwicke and Young, kept their offices, and Argyle was reinstated as Master of the Horse. The new ministry was a sort of coalition of the Whigs, all Tories being strictly excluded from the arrangement. Pulteney refused to take office, and retired to the Upper House as Lord Bath. Walpole took the title of Lord Orford, and Carteret became the most important member of the Government, and virtual Prime Minister.

Wilmington's Ministry, 1742-1743.

During the ensuing years England experienced a religious no less than a political awakening. Both movements, of which the leaders were respectively John Wesley (p. 237) and William Pitt, represented a reaction against the deadening influence of Walpole's system upon Church and State. From Walpole's fall, too, must be dated the definite beginning of the struggle by the people to convert the House of Commons from an oligarchic body into a popular assembly in touch with the nation, and the growth of the corporate responsibility of members of the Cabinet. Beyond the appointment of a committee to inquire into the conduct of the late Prime Minister, and the passage of a Place Bill to limit the number of offices tenable by members of Parliament—a Bill which had a salutary effect in checking the royal influence—the domestic policy of the new Government was in no way noteworthy. On the death of Wilmington in July, 1743, it was dissolved.

The Reaction in Religion and Politics.

After an attempt on the part of Lord Bath, supported by Carteret, to become Prime Minister, Henry Pelham, a representative of the party of Walpole, succeeded Wilmington. The new ministry soon found themselves out of touch with Carteret's complicated foreign policy, and, irritated at his arrogance and suspicious of his projects, they insisted on his withdrawal from the Government in November, 1744. His retirement was followed by that of Lord Winchilsea and others, and Pelham was then able to establish the Broad-Bottom Administration by introducing into the Government Whigs like Harrington, who succeeded Carteret, Grenville, Henry Fox, Bedford and Grafton, dissentient Whigs such as Lord Chesterfield, and Tories like Lord Gower and Sir John Hind Cotton. A victory had been gained over the king, opposition to the ministry was suppressed, and Pelham and his colleagues continued the war with vigour. But the unrepresentative character of the House of Commons and the Hanoverian sympathies of the king checked any enthusiasm on the part of the country for either Parliament or the Crown. Sir George Dashwood's amendment to the address demanding for the people "the right to be freely and fairly represented in Parliament" was not carried, and the consequent indifference of the English people to domestic politics was exhibited during the Jacobite rebellion. In February, 1746, at the height of this crisis, the ministry most unpatriotically resigned in order to force the king to admit William Pitt to office, and on the failure of Carteret, now Lord Granville, to form a Government, the Pelhams returned to office with Pitt as Vice-Treasurer of Ireland,* and Henry Fox as Secretary for War. The suppression of the Jacobite movement (p. 191) was followed by the disarmament of the Highlanders, the abolition of the jurisdiction of the Highland chiefs, and the prohibition of the national dress. On the conclusion of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle Pelham carried out a number of useful reforms. He took advantage of the prosperity of the country and reduced the rate of interest on the National Debt from four to three per cent. In 1752, on the motion of Lord Chesterfield, the calendar was reformed (p. 353), and the following year Lord Hard-

Pelham's Ministry, 1743-1754.

The Broad-Bottom Administration.

* Pitt shortly afterwards became Paymaster-General of the Forces.

wicke's Marriage Act (p. 354), a measure for the prevention of clandestine marriages, was passed, and also an Act for the naturalisation of the Jews, which however, owing to the popular outcry, was repealed the following session.

Death of Pelham, 1754. Newcastle Prime Minister.

In 1754 the death of Henry Pelham put an end to the period of tranquillity in party life which his conciliatory policy had brought about, and George II.'s prediction that he would have no more peace proved absolutely true. The Duke of Newcastle, Pelham's elder brother, became head of the ministry. Though personally honest, and unequalled in experience of business and parliamentary management, he made a serious mistake in appointing Sir Thomas Robinson, a dull man, leader of the House of Commons, where he became the object of attacks by Pitt and Henry Fox. In 1755 Fox took Robinson's place and became Secretary of State, and in the autumn Pitt and Legge, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, were dismissed for opposing the Russian and Hessian subsidies. The loss of Minorca in May, 1756, roused the popular anger, and Newcastle resigned in November, being succeeded by the Duke of Devonshire with Pitt as First Secretary of State and virtual Prime Minister. Pitt at once adopted the measures which the situation of affairs demanded. Highland regiments were formed, a bill for increasing the militia was passed, and reinforcements were sent to America. He was unable to save Byng, and after three months of office the ministry fell. For eleven weeks the country was without a Government. At length the king and Pitt agreed to a compromise, and the Newcastle-Pitt ministry was formed, with Fox as Paymaster-General. The success of the English during the Seven Years' War (pp. 185, 200) was due in great measure to the national enthusiasm stimulated by confidence in William Pitt, whose tenure of office marks an epoch in English history.

The Devonshire-Pitt Administration.

The Newcastle-Pitt Ministry, 1757–1761.

With the accession of George III. in October, 1760, followed by the fall of Pitt and the rise of Bute, began a series of vindictive attacks on the Whigs and a definite attempt on the part of the king to recover for the royal power many of the prerogatives which the Crown had enjoyed previous to the Revolution of 1688.

The Accession of George III.

From 1760 to 1770 the king asserted his right to choose his own ministers and his intention of breaking up the Whig domination. During these ten years the struggle continued, ending in the accession of Lord North to office and the triumph of George. The reasons of his success are not hard to find. Since 1688 the Whigs had virtually ruled England; and owing to the fact that the first two Georges were foreigners, Prime Ministers found themselves practically supreme. George III., who prided himself on being an Englishman, determined to resume the power which his predecessors had abdicated to Walpole and his successors. He came to the throne at a time when the people had begun to feel that the House of Commons did not represent them. The Tories, practically excluded since the accession of George I. from the government of the country, could no longer be accused of Jacobite leanings, and now rallied round the throne; while the king, taking advantage of the popular dislike of the Whigs, laid out enormous sums in parliamentary and electoral corruption, and

"in maintaining in Parliament a body of men whose political attachment centered in the king alone, who looked to him alone for promotion, who, though often holding places in the Government, were expected rather to control than to support it, and if it diverged from the policy which was personally acceptable to the king, to combine against it and overthrow it." *

His Attack on Cabinet Government.

Thus supported by a compact body of "the king's friends," by the Tories and by popular opinion, George III. began his attempt to break down the system of exclusion, to restore the royal authority, to destroy the principle, which was as yet only partially recognised, that the Cabinet should consist of a body of statesmen who were in thorough political agreement and were jointly responsible for all the measures they proposed, and to substitute in its place what is known as the "departmental system," in accordance with which each minister was responsible for his own department and answerable to the king for his actions. The great Whig party had, even during Walpole's period of office, tended to fall into sections. At the time of the accession of George III. the official Whigs were led by Newcastle and on his resignation by Rockingham, while from this main body of Whigs

* Lecky, "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," vol. iii., p. 21.

the Bedford connection and the Grenville connection stood aloof, and before long Pitt gathered round him a body of followers who opposed corruption on the one hand and aristocratic exclusion on the other.

Struggle Between the King and the Whigs, 1760-1770.

George III.'s first attempt to establish his own independence was not successful. Bute's short ministry distinguished itself for corruption and incapacity, and came to a sudden end on April 8th, 1763. Bute was succeeded by George Grenville, who made few changes in the Government. Grenville's ministry is celebrated for two blunders, the attack on Wilkes and the attempt to tax the American colonies. In 1763 John Wilkes, editor of the *North Briton*, was with forty-nine other persons arrested under a general warrant signed by Lord Halifax, Secretary of State, for attacking in No. 45 the king's speech. The mistaken action of the Government resulted in the complete triumph of Wilkes. His arrest as a member of Parliament was declared illegal, general warrants were decided to be contrary to the law, as were "warrants to search for, seize and carry away papers." After his release Wilkes prosecuted Lord Halifax and Mr. Wood, Under-Secretary of State, and obtained heavy damages.

The Affair of Wilkes.

Both Houses of Parliament, however, continued the crusade against Wilkes. The Commons before the end of 1763 voted No. 45 "a false, scandalous and seditious libel," while the House of Lords voted a certain "Essay on Woman," printed by Wilkes, "a scandalous, obscene and impious libel." In the meantime Wilkes, after recovering from the effects of a duel, went over to Paris, and in his absence the House of Commons on January 19th, 1764, expelled him for having written "a scandalous and seditious libel," while on February 21st he was found guilty at the Court of King's Bench for re-printing No. 45 and for publishing the "Essay on Woman"; and as he did not appear for sentence was outlawed. Popular indignation against the Court and ministers by this time ran high, and the Common Council of London thanked their member for asserting the liberties of the country in the matter of general warrants. Wilkes was supported by Newcastle, Rockingham and Shelburne in the Lords, and by Pitt and Barré in the Commons. Grenville's

next blunder in introducing the Stamp Act—an attempt to levy an internal tax on the American colonies, and an infringement of the principle that no people should be taxed except by themselves, or through their representatives—led to more serious consequences. But before he could see the effect of his policy the ministry had come to an end. Though in September, 1763, it had been joined by Bedford and his section, the ministry had never been strong, and George's dislike to it was increased by Bedford's management of the Regency Bill and by Grenville's obstinacy and want of tact. After Pitt's refusal to take office the king was forced to have recourse to the main body of the Whigs, who under Rockingham returned to office in July, 1765. Rockingham attempted to undo the mischief caused by Grenville's action with regard to Wilkes and the American colonies and repealed the Stamp Act, passing in its place a Declaratory Act, which merely stated the right of the English Government to tax America, and so averted for the time the struggle with the colonists. On July 7th, 1766, Rockingham fell, and was succeeded by the Duke of Grafton and Pitt. In spite of the admirable measures passed by the Rockingham ministry, such as the condemnation of general warrants, the repeal of the Stamp Act (p. 328), a commercial treaty with Russia, and a modification in the unpopular cider tax, the king had little difficulty in overthrowing it. Its fall was mainly due to Pitt's refusal to support Rockingham. Pitt was hostile to government by party, he was not in agreement with the Declaratory Act, he disliked Burke's free trade views, he thought the Rockingham Whigs exclusive and aristocratic. His refusal to join the Rockingham Government has been described as "the most disastrous incident in his career."* It was only by the union of Pitt and his followers with the Rockingham Whigs that a strong government could be formed.

Continuance of the Struggle with the Whigs.

The incoherent Government known as the Grafton ministry included Pitt, Townshend, North, Shelburne, Barré, Conway, Camden, and was a mixture of the followers of Rockingham and Pitt and of the "King's Friends." At first it adopted a progressive attitude. Unfortunately Pitt, who on becoming Lord Chatham had lost his influence in the

* Lecky, Vol. III., p. 98.

country, soon fell ill and resigned, leaving the Grafton ministry for four years to attempt, with little success, to grapple with its difficulties. Gradually most of the followers of Rockingham retired, and were replaced by the Bedford Whigs, who supported the king in his views about Wilkes and American taxation.

The Middlesex Election, 1768.

At the general election of 1768 Wilkes was returned for Middlesex, and the same year he surrendered to the Court of King's Bench, and was imprisoned for twenty-two months and fined. During a disturbance near the prison the soldiers fired on the mob, and in consequence Wilkes wrote a fierce attack on Lord Weymouth, the Secretary of State. On February 3rd, 1769, he was expelled from Parliament on account of his "Essay on Woman," No. 45, and his letter on Lord Weymouth. On February 16th he was re-elected, and the next day the Commons resolved that "he was incapable for sitting in the present Parliament." Finally, after his fourth re-election the Commons declared that Colonel Luttrel "ought to have been elected," and gave him the seat. Meanwhile, Charles Townshend, Chancellor of the Exchequer, had in 1767 passed an Act for taxing American imports by various small customs duties, and had caused profound irritation in America.

North Prime Minister. The Triumph of the King, 1770–1782.

On Townshend's death and the secession of Shelburne, Chatham and Grenville, the Government fell to pieces, and George III., taking advantage of the prevailing disunion among parties, placed Lord North at the head of affairs. Though the influence of the Middlesex election was far-reaching—resulting in the birth of English Radicalism, in attempts to reform Parliament, in the beginning of popular meetings to discuss grievances, and in the establishment of small political societies, such as the Society of the Supporters of the Bill of Rights—the period of Lord North's tenure of office from 1770–82 saw no great constitutional changes. The attention of the nation was at first fixed upon the American quarrel, and after 1778 upon the war against France, Spain, and Holland.

Still, though North's ministry marks the triumph of the king and the temporary establishment of the system of departmental government, symptoms were not wanting

during his twelve years of office of a desire on the part of the people for Parliamentary and other reforms.

In 1771 Parliamentary reporting was recognised, owing to the firm attitude taken by the Lord Mayor of London and Wilkes in opposition to the House of Commons. In 1774 the king unfortunately persuaded North to pass the Royal Marriage Act, giving the reigning sovereign the power of vetoing any marriages made by members of the royal family. In 1778 Sir George Saville carried a measure for the repeal of many of the Catholic disabilities, and in consequence, in 1780, the Gordon riots broke out, which were only suppressed by the firmness of George III. himself. Till 1780, owing to the factious character of the Opposition, North's position was overwhelmingly strong; but with the disasters which marked the later phases of the American contest the Chatham and Rockingham Whigs (the former, since Chatham's death, under the leadership of Shelburne) united, and public opinion showed itself in 1780 in the great Yorkshire petition for economical reform, in Burke's Bill to further the same object, in Dunning's motion "that the power of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished," and in the Duke of Richmond's Reform Bill advocating annual Parliaments, manhood suffrage, and electoral districts. Chatham had, in 1770, suggested that a third member should be given to each county, and in 1776 Wilkes had proposed to disfranchise the rotten boroughs and to give their members to counties and populous towns. In March, 1782, shortly after the arrival of the news of the capture of Minorca, North resigned, and Rockingham formed his second ministry, composed of his own followers and the Chatham or Shelburne Whigs. Shelburne and Fox were Secretaries of State, Thurlow Lord Chancellor, and Burke was Paymaster of the Forces. Economical reforms were at once carried out, Government contractors were excluded from the House of Commons, and revenue officers were debarred from voting at elections. To Ireland legislative independence was given (p. 363), but before any further measures could be carried Rockingham died in July, 1782.

The Royal Marriage Act.

The Gordon Riots, 1780.

Rockingham's Second Ministry, 1782.

The two divisions of the Whigs, headed by Shelburne and Fox respectively, being unable to agree, George III. at once appointed Shelburne Prime Minister, who on the retirement of Fox, Burke, and Cavendish, reorganised the Government, making the young William Pitt Chancellor of the Exchequer. After a few months, during which the Peace of Versailles was signed, Fox and North joined forces, overthrew Shelburne, and on April 2nd, 1783, formed the famous Coalition Ministry, with the Duke of Portland as Prime Minister and Fox and North as Secretaries of State. The coalition was very unpopular in the country, and the king took advantage of the feeling excited against Fox's India Bill to bring his personal influence to procure the rejection of the measure by the House of Lords. On December 18th the ministers were dismissed, and Pitt, at the age of twenty-four, was made Prime Minister. After an exciting Parliamentary battle, which lasted till March, 1784, public opinion declared so strongly against the conduct of Fox and his party that Pitt dissolved Parliament on March 25th, and at the general election the Whigs were hopelessly routed, and Pitt was returned to power with an overwhelming majority.

The Coalition of Fox and North.

George III. had, as in 1770, won a great and apparently a decisive triumph. In 1782 the Whigs had ousted Lord North and the Tories from office, and seemed likely to hold the reins of power for a prolonged period. But the death of Rockingham, followed by the renewal of divisions and jealousies in the Whig party, had led Fox to commit the tactical blunder of making a coalition with North. His error proved fatal to the fortunes of the Whig party, which, if the short Ministry of All the Talents be excepted, remained in the shade of opposition till the time of the Reform Bill. George III. had again secured the appointment of the Prime Minister, and Pitt remained in office till 1801.

Triumph of George III., 1784.

With the fall of Walpole English foreign policy entered definitely upon a new and important phase. With the opening of the War of the Austrian Succession it became impossible for England, with enormous interests in America, India and Europe, to

England's Foreign Policy.

stand aside and see her ally, Austria, despoiled by an immoral coalition. From 1740 to 1748, while England aided Maria Theresa in Europe she contended with France and Spain on the sea and in the colonies. From 1756 to 1763, in alliance with Frederick the Great, she gave valuable assistance to Prussia, while she continued and practically concluded her duel with France in America and India. After the conclusion of the Peace of Paris in 1763 she remained isolated in Europe till the beginning of the ministry of the younger Pitt in 1784. During these years France and Spain took ample revenge for their losses in the Seven Years' War by successfully aiding the Americans to secure their independence. During the whole of the period under review the guiding principles of English policy was hostility to the Bourbons, the development of the colonies and commerce, and the preservation of the balance of power in Europe, especially in the Mediterranean and Baltic, while till 1763 the desire to secure the safety of Hanover affected the relations of England with the German Powers.

The Importance of the Period 1742–1784.

England's foreign policy after the fall of Walpole gained in vigour and definiteness. The new Ministry under Wilmington found itself at war with Spain and involved in a struggle between Prussia and Austria for the possession of Silesia, which was rapidly leading to the outbreak of open hostilities with France in India, in America and on the sea. The question of maritime supremacy, together with the further questions of the establishment of the English or French influence in India and the supremacy of the Teutonic or Latin race in North America, awaited decision. Though Wilmington was nominally Prime Minister, Carteret directed the foreign policy of the Government. He had a considerable knowledge of Continental affairs, and had shown no little skill as English Envoy at Stockholm during Stanhope's ministry. Like Walpole he saw clearly that Maria Theresa's true policy was to acquiesce in the loss of Silesia, but unlike Walpole he proposed to throw England energetically into the European war, and to combat the Bourbons in Germany, in the Netherlands, and in Italy. To the overthrow of the Bourbons all efforts were to be directed and all minor questions were to be subordinated. Hence Carteret

Carteret's Policy.

and George II. attempted, though in vain, to persuade Maria Theresa to recognise Charles Albert of Bavaria as Emperor, to accept the loss of Silesia, to make peace with Prussia, and to concentrate all her efforts upon an attack on France. The Grand Alliance of 1701 was to be revived and the work of the Whigs, interrupted—and in Carteret's opinion seriously impaired—by the Tory Peace of Utrecht, was to be completed. Success attended the diplomatic and warlike efforts of the English Ministers. The first Silesian war ended with the Treaties of Breslau and Berlin in 1742, by which Maria Theresa unwillingly agreed to the loss of Silesia; the English fleet was successful in the Mediterranean, and a combined army of English, Hessians and Hanoverians, known as the "Pragmatic Army," and under the command of George II., won the battle of Dettingen (p. 189) on June 27th, 1743.

The Treaty of Worms, 1743.

An attempt was now made to open negotiations with a view to a general peace. Prussia had gained Silesia, Maria Theresa's position was assured, the French had been driven back. But as long as Austrian troops occupied Bavaria, and the Emperor Charles VII. was a fugitive, it was impossible to carry out any peaceful arrangements. A scheme known as the Agreement of Hanau, devised by George II. and Carteret to meet this difficulty, ended in failure, and in place of the proposed agreement the Treaty of Worms between England, Holland, Austria, Saxony and Sardinia was signed in September, 1743, the contracting Powers undertaking to assure the European balance of power and the Pragmatic Sanction. This treaty was met by the Treaty of Fontainebleau between France and Spain, a secret treaty in which Louis XV. and Philip V. agreed to restore Bavaria to the Emperor, to capture Gibraltar, Minorca and Georgia from England, to annul the Assiento Contract (p. 13), and to hand over Parma, Piacenza and Milan to Don Philip, the second son of Elizabeth Farnese. In March, 1744, France declared war against England, and in April against Austria. In September Frederick the Great, alarmed for the safety of Silesia and suspicious of the Austrian schemes with regard to Bavaria, invaded Bohemia and began the second Silesian War; in November Henry Pelham, who had succeeded Wilmington on the

The Fall of Carteret, and After.

latter's death in July, 1743, secured the dismissal of Carteret, whose independence and arrogance had alienated his fellow ministers. The difficulties of the English Government had vastly increased with the expansion of the war. Open hostilities with France were now waged by sea and by land, and though in June, 1744, Cape Breton Island was won and in September Maria Theresa's husband was elected Emperor, the English were defeated in May at Fontenoy, and in July the Pretender, Charles Edward, landed in Scotland, and the insurrectionary standard was raised (p. 358). His victory of Prestonpans on September 21st, followed by his march into England as far as Derby, threw London into a panic. His retirement was a great relief to the Government, and though Charles won the battle of Falkirk on January 17th, 1746, he was finally overthrown by the Duke of Cumberland at Culloden on April 16th and escaped to France. The attempts of the French Government to invade England had ended in failure, but Marshal Saxe proved invincible in Flanders, and the battle of Raucoux, in November, 1746, practically laid the whole of the Austrian Netherlands at his feet. In April, 1747, France declared war against Holland, and the Duke of Cumberland, while endeavouring to prevent an invasion of the United Provinces, was in July defeated by Marshal Saxe at Laufeld. Bergen-op-Zoom fell and Maestricht was besieged. All the combatants were now exhausted. Though a Russian army was marching across Germany to the aid of the allies, the Pelhams, alarmed at the prospect of the immediate fall of Maestricht, hastened on the peace negotiations. On April 30th, 1748, the preliminaries were signed by France, England and Holland. England and France agreed to a mutual restoration of all conquests, and Spain consented to restore the Assiento Treaty, Prussia obtained Silesia, and Sardinia a portion of the Milanese, while Don Philip secured Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla. Though Maria Theresa had suffered some territorial losses, the Pragmatic Sanction was recognised, and England had the satisfaction of seeing her ally Austria in a strong position. With her maritime supremacy secured, England could look forward without apprehension to the renewal of the struggle with France. After the conclusion of the war the questions at issue

The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.

between England and France in America and India remained unsettled, and the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle was merely a truce. The years between 1748 and 1756 form a period of unrest leading to the Seven Years' War. Nominally England was connected with Austria, Russia and Saxony, and opposed to France, Spain and Prussia.

The Years from 1748–1756.

The English Government, however, while anxious to preserve the balance of power in the Baltic and to remain on good terms with Russia, refused to acquiesce in the aggressive schemes of the Tsarina Elizabeth and Maria Theresa against the Prussian King. With Austria England's relations became every year less friendly. Walpole's peace policy during the Polish Succession War and his opposition to the Ostend East India Company had shaken the friendship of Charles VI. with England, while the policy of Carteret and his successors in recommending Maria Theresa to acquiesce in the cession of Silesia, of portions of the Milanese and of Parma to Frederick the Great, Charles Emmanuel and Don Philip respectively, had roused the bitterest resentment of the Empress-Queen. The Court of Vienna chafed under the terms of the Barrier Treaty; it was determined to regain Silesia. Under the advice of Kaunitz negotiations were opened with France which, as soon as the Convention of Westminster, concluded in January, 1756, between England and Prussia, was known, led to the First Treaty of Versailles in May, followed by the Second Treaty a year later. A war between England and France over their American possessions being inevitable, George II. had become very anxious about the safety of Hanover, while Prussia desired protection against Russia and Austria. Hence the two Powers had agreed by the Convention of Westminster to guarantee the neutrality of Germany. Though England and Russia remained at peace, the old alliance between England and Austria came to an end, and while Russia, Austria, France and Saxony prepared to attack Prussia, England and France began the final struggle for supremacy in India and America. When Frederick the Great opened the Seven Years' War in August, 1756, by the invasion of Saxony, disasters overtook the English fleets in the Mediterranean,

The Diplomatic Revolution of 1756.

Pitt and the Seven Years' War.

and Minorca was lost. It was not till July, 1757, that the great Pitt-Newcastle administration gave to England one of the strongest and most successful Ministries of the century.

By maintaining and increasing the subsidies to Frederick the Great, Pitt kept the French employed on the Continent, while his admirals and generals gained the New World, and destroyed all hopes of French supremacy in India. The Convention of Klosterseven, made on September 10th, 1757, by the Duke of Cumberland with the French, was repudiated, and after Frederick's signal victory of Rosbach on November 5th, 1757, Ferdinand of Brunswick, who took charge of the operations in Western Germany, kept the French in check until the end of the war.

The year 1759, the great year of victories, saw the defeat of the French at Minden on the 1st of August, the almost complete destruction of the French fleets at Lagos and Quiberon Bay, and the capture of Guadaloupe, Ticonderoga, Fort Niagara, Quebec (p. 200), followed the ensuing year by the fall of Montreal. Choiseul, the French Minister, thereupon opened negotiations, which led to no results, and the war continued.

The death of Ferdinand VI. of Spain in 1759, followed by that of George II. in the following year, brought about important changes in the policy of France and England. The new King of Spain, Charles III., made, in August, 1761, a Family Compact with France, engaging to declare war against England if peace was not concluded before May, 1762. Pitt, suspecting the existence of this compact, wished to declare war upon Spain and seize the annual Plate fleet before its arrival at Cadiz. George III. and Bute, who had succeeded Holderness as Secretary of State for the Northern Department, being eager for peace, opposed Pitt, who thereupon resigned in October, 1761.

The Fall of Pitt and the Peace of Paris, 1763.

In 1762 Bute became First Lord of the Treasury, and found himself compelled to continue Pitt's foreign policy. War with Spain was declared in January, 1762, and proved consistently successful. Bute, however, was bent on peace at almost any price, and in November, 1762, the preliminaries were signed. England kept Canada, Tobago, Dominica, St. Vincent, Grenada, Senegal, Gorée, and Minorca. France,

having recovered Martinique, Guadaloupe, St. Lucia, and Belle-isle, kept the rights of fishing round Newfoundland, with the two small islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. Spain ceded to England Florida and all her possessions to south and south-east of the Mississippi, receiving from France Louisiana. England's right to cut down mahogany in Honduras was also recognised. In India the French, though recovering their factories, were to have no military establishments. The peace of Paris was very unpopular in the country, and there is no doubt that though the gains of England were great, Bute, in his haste to conclude peace, threw away many advantages. He had alienated our ally, Frederick the Great, by suddenly suspending the annual subsidies, and by negotiations with the Court of Vienna. Moreover, the Prussian king remained, till his death, convinced that Bute had attempted to persuade the Tsar, Peter III., to attack him.

In February, 1763, the Peace of Paris and the Peace of Hubertsburg between Prussia and Austria were signed, and the Seven Years' War came to an end. By her subsidies to Frederick and by attacks upon the French colonies, her sea coasts and her commerce, England, while largely contributing to the safety of Prussia, had established her own maritime supremacy.

Foreign Policy After the Peace of Paris.

From 1763 to 1784 England felt the effects (1) of the foreign policy of Bute and (2) of the conquest of Canada. During these twenty-one years, her Ministers being occupied with political dissensions and disputes with America, she was, to a great extent, isolated in Europe, while the American colonists, freed from the constant fear of French aggression, prepared to assert their independence of the mother country. No sooner was peace concluded than Choiseul and Grimaldi, the French and Spanish ministers, took energetic steps to reorganise the naval and military services of their respective countries. Prussia remained steadily hostile to England during the remainder of Frederick the Great's life; while Portugal, under the influence of Pombal, a friend of Choiseul, and Holland, jealous of England's commercial supremacy, were inclined to support the French Court in its hostile attitude to Great Britain.

With Russia England remained on friendly terms. English admirals and officers aided the Russian fleet during the Turkish war which began in 1768, and the decisive victory of Tchesmé was due to the skill of an Englishman. The friendship of Russia and England, Chatham declared, was a corner-stone in our Continental policy, and during his short period of office in the Grafton ministry, from 1766 to 1770, he attempted to bring about a close alliance between England, Prussia, and Russia against the House of Bourbon, which he and many of his contemporaries regarded with feelings of the deepest hostility. Though Frederick the Great, now closely allied with Catherine II. by the secret treaty of 1764, refused to enter into any alliance with England, Englishmen continued to aid the Russians in the Turkish war till Catherine's successes alarmed the English Government, and all British subjects were withdrawn from the Russian service. In 1772 and 1773, though England took no steps to hinder the partition of Poland, she refused to support Catherine II. in any interference with the domestic affairs of Sweden. Gustavus III. had carried out a successful revolution on August 19th, 1772, and the English Government, determined to preserve the balance of power in the Baltic, not only persisted in its policy of non-intervention, but prevented the entrance of a French squadron into that sea.

England and Russia.

The outbreak of the American war gave France and Russia their revenge. In 1778 the French recognised the independence of the colonists, and war broke out between France and England. In 1779 and 1780 Spain (p. 206) and Holland followed the example of France, and England realised her isolation in Europe. In her extremity she attempted to make an alliance with Russia, and asked Catherine for the aid of 20,000 troops to restrain "the increasing frenzy of his Majesty's unhappy and deluded people on the other side of the Atlantic." But Catherine, influenced by Panin, the supporter of the Prussian alliance, refused the English demand, and did not hesitate to form the Armed Neutrality of 1780, which included, besides Russia, France, Spain, Prussia, Holland, Sweden, and Denmark. All chance of assistance from Russia was lost, though Catherine her-

The American War of Independence.

self showed no intention of engaging in a war on behalf of the principles which she had adopted. Deplorable as the condition of England was at the close of the year 1780, and during part of 1781, the English Government, strengthened by the popular feeling against the French, Spaniards, and Dutch, never ceased its efforts.

Though French and Spanish fleets, for a second time during the war, remained, in 1781, for some weeks supreme in the English Channel, Gibraltar remained unconquered, while the Dutch lost not only St. Eustatius and the colonies of Demerara and Essequibo, and many of their eastern settlements, but a large number of merchantmen and some ships of war. Determined, if possible, to secure the aid of Russia, the English Government, in 1781, offered to Catherine the island of Minorca as a price of her alliance.* Fortunately, the Tsarina did not appreciate the value to Russia of an island in the western basin of the Mediterranean, and the proposal of England was declined. The surrender of Yorktown on October 19th, 1781, was followed by the recognition of the independence of America by Holland, and by the opening of peace negotiations. In the latter part of 1782 provisional articles of peace between England and the United States were signed; on January 20th, 1782, those with France and Spain. The independence of America was recognised by England, while to France were restored St. Lucia, Tobago, Senegal, Gorée, Pondicherry, Carical, the port of Mahé, and their establishments in Orissa and Bengal, and to Spain Minorca and East Florida. England, however, recovered Dominica, Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Christopher, Nevis and Montserrat, Fort James and the River Gambia, and her right to cut logwood in Honduras Bay was again recognised. The Treaty of Versailles, signed in January, 1783, formally closed the war with America, and the treaties with France and Spain were signed the same day. On his accession to office William Pitt found England exhausted with the late war, still isolated in Europe, and with her prestige in Europe low. It remained for him to restore that prestige, and to prove to the world that England was still worthy of being ranked among the leading European powers.

The Peace of Versailles, 1783.

* "Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury," vol. i., p. 373.

DURING the last century it was a common saying among Continental officers that England possessed an "army of lions, led by asses." Our military history from 1742 to 1783 justifies the sarcasm, for among all the men to whom was intrusted the conduct of our wars, two only—Wolfe and Clive—really distinguished themselves. Most of our other generals were dullards, remembered only in connection with victories won by the hard fighting of their soldiers, and defeats caused by their own stupidity. Yet opportunities for distinction were not lacking. Our wars were almost incessant; and the short intervals of peace were but truces, ill-observed both in India and in America.

G. LE M. GRETTON. The Army.

Early in 1743 the British troops quitted their winter quarters in the Low Countries; a force of 40,000 English and Hanoverians was placed under the command of Lord Stair, and marched to Germany to effect a junction with the Austrians. Stair was out-manœuvred by De Noailles, the French general, and when George II. arrived to take command, he found the allies in a sorry plight, without supplies, and hemmed in between a river, the deep and rapid Main, and mountains impassable for troops. De Noailles, with 60,000 men, awaited their surrender, which appeared inevitable. King George instantly retired along the river, but De Noailles flung part of his army across the Main at Dettingen, and there seized a defile through which the retreating troops must pass; his batteries played upon them from the far side of the river; a detachment from his main body followed in their rear. Disaster seemed imminent, when the commander of the French detachment which barred the way at Dettingen recklessly descended from the heights commanding the defile, and advanced into the plain to offer battle to the allies. The engagement opened with a prolonged artillery duel, followed by ineffectual cavalry charges on each side. Then the hostile infantry met, and after a sharp struggle the French were driven back across the Main with the loss of some 7,000 men. To King George the cost of the victory is said to have been about 3,000 killed or wounded.

Dettingen.

Wolfe, who, at the age of sixteen was already adjutant of

his regiment, in a letter to his father throws light on the discipline, or indiscipline, of the troops:—

"The Major and I (for we had neither Colonel nor Lieutenant-colonel), before the French came near, were employed in begging and ordering the men not to fire at too great a distance, but to keep it till the enemy should come near us; but to little purpose. The whole fired when they thought they could reach them, which was like to have ruined us. We did very little execution with it. As soon as the French saw we presented they all fell down, and when we had fired they got up, and marched close to us in tolerable good order, and gave us a brisk fire, which put us into some disorder, and made us give way a little . . . . . However, we soon rallied again, and attacked them with great fury, which gained us a complete victory, and forced the enemy to retire in great haste."

The Column at Fontenoy.

With the battle of Dettingen ends the interest of the campaign; that of the succeeding year is barren of events; but in 1745 "the cockpit of Europe" once more saw a great pitched battle between the English and the French. The French, 76,000 strong, under the celebrated Marshal Saxe, were laying siege to the fortress of Tournay, key to the Austrian Netherlands. In advancing to relieve its garrison, a mixed force of 53,000 allies, English and Hanoverians, Dutch and Austrians, encountered the French near Fontenoy in a position naturally strong, and greatly strengthened by Saxe's field-works. In the combined attack the Dutch and the Austrians were beaten back; but the Duke of Cumberland vowed that the English and Hanoverians, unaided, should retrieve the day. He formed his brigades into one massive column, about 16,000 strong, and moved majestically against the French. At first the valour of the redcoats carried all before them; neither incessant volleys of musketry from Saxe's infantry nor a hail of grape from his flanking batteries could stay their progress. The French footguards broke and fled before them. The French cavalry charged repeatedly, and with such vigour that their horses' breasts met our soldiers' bayonets; but in vain. The British colours were already waving over the French camp, and Saxe had sent to advise his king, Louis XV., to provide for his own safety by flight, when the tide of battle suddenly turned. Saxe brought up guns to play at point-blank range upon his exhausted though victorious foe. He launched against them a forlorn hope, the Maison du Roi, the French Life Guards, and the Irish brigade

—gallant men whom the policy of our Government had forced into a foreign service. The French footguards rallied and once more fiercely charged. To meet this fresh attack fresh troops were needed, but Cumberland had no reserve of Englishmen, and our allies made no effort to support him. The men could do no more. Slowly and sullenly they retreated in good order and fighting hard, but the day was lost; and though all Europe rang with the exploit of the British column, the French gained the solid fruits of the victory. The allies, paralysed by the absence of the English, who were hastily recalled to meet the Stuart rising in Scotland, looked on inactive, while the chief fortresses of the Netherlands fell one by one into the hands of Marshal Saxe. Until 1747 England was too busy at home to occupy herself in Continental affairs. Then the old policy was resumed. An English army was sent to Flanders, supported by large contingents of allies, often more eager to receive their subsidies of English gold than to earn them by hard fighting. At the desperate but indecisive battle of Laffeldt, near Maestricht, to so marked a degree did the brunt of the fighting fall on the English that Louis XV. observed "the English not only paid all, but fought for all!"

The invasion of the Young Pretender found the English ministers so agitated, so hysterical, so unprepared for war in their own country, that a French marshal, a prisoner in London, declared that "with 20,000 scullions of the French army he would engage to conquer England." Happily no French landing took place, for the military resources of England were sufficiently taxed in dealing with the Stuart rising. The battle of Prestonpans proved the wisdom of an officer who had said that "our soldiers should accustom themselves to the sight of foreign troops, that they may be less at a loss, and act like men when anything new or extravagant presents itself, and that a plaid, whiskers, or a ruff cap may not be esteemed by them altogether terrible and invincible." For the third time in history British regular troops fled panic-stricken before a Highland charge: Sir John Cope was routed, and Charles Edward became the master of Scotland. The rebels invaded England, and had reached Derby, when they decided to return to Scotland. There, in January, 1746, took place the indecisive combat of

The '45.

Falkirk, where the rain was so furious that the men's powder and firelocks became damp and unserviceable. In April was fought near Inverness the battle of Culloden, where the hopes of the Stuarts were finally extinguished. Charles Edward attempted to surprise the Duke of Cumberland at dawn, but his night march (one of the most difficult operations in war) was a failure; and the English general had ample time to make his preparations before the enemy appeared. The artillery commenced to play upon the Highlanders, which "made them very uneasy, and, after firing a quarter of an hour, obliged them to change their situation and move forward some hundred yards to attack our front line of foot, which they did with more fury than prudence, throwing down their firearms and advancing with their drawn swords. They were, however, repulsed, and ran off with the greatest precipitation, and the Dragoons, falling in among them, completed the victory with much slaughter." While the fight lasted, it was sharp. Out of one battalion of veterans from the Low Countries, which went into action 350 strong, no less than 120 were killed or wounded.

In 1748 Europe, weary of bloodshed, cried truce, and patched up a general peace at Aix-la-Chapelle, one of the clauses of which provided for a restitution of conquests. In Asia, France returned to England the settlement of Madras, wrested by her traders from the East India Company. In America the English garrison evacuated the fortress of Louisbourg, which had been captured in 1745, and the white ensign of France once more floated over the Dunkirk of the North. Between England and France the peace was but a nominal one. The rivalry of the two nations soon broke out on the banks of the Ohio. France had long raised a shadowy and unfounded claim to the whole of the North American Continent west of the Alleghany mountains, and sought to confine the subjects of Great Britain to the narrow space between these mountains and the Atlantic.

Unofficial War with France in America.

The provincials, as the colonists were termed, ignored the French pretensions, and resolutely traded and prospered among the Indians of the Ohio valley. This the French resented. From Paris, in 1753, came orders to the Governor of Canada to incite the Indians to destroy the British trading-stations;

but on no account was he to be found out, as the two nations were not at war! As the irregular troops of France and England raced for the possession of an important strategic point on the upper waters of the Ohio, the inevitable collision took place. Our handful of provincials was commanded by Washington, the future President of the United States, then serving his apprenticeship to arms as a major of Virginia militia. Outnumbered and defeated, his whole force were taken prisoners; and for the moment the French dominated the valley of the Ohio from Fort Duquesne, which they built near the scene of their victory, on the site of the present great city of Pittsburg.

Next year each country prepared to reinforce her colonial troops. Braddock was sent to Virginia with two battalions. De Vaudreil was ordered to Quebec with six battalions, escorted by eighteen French men-of-war. While the French diplomatists were amusing the Court of St. James with assurances of the entirely pacific nature of the expedition, Louis XV. issued secret orders to the Governor of Canada. He was to attack British territory, to employ Indian warriors against the settlers, but, to avoid compromising his Government, he was resolutely to maintain that he was acting without orders from home. The English Government were equally unscrupulous. They despatched a squadron to cruise in the Atlantic, with secret orders to capture or sink every French vessel proceeding to North America. The fogs off Newfoundland protected the French: only three of their ships were taken by Boscawen, the British admiral; the rest escaped and reached Quebec in safety. It is hardly to be believed that war was not formally declared between the two countries until more than a year after the perpetration of this outrage.

In the middle of the last century Quebec, the capital of Canada, could only be reached by water, and all the approaches were commanded by the French. To the east the St. Lawrence was blocked by Louisbourg, whose active garrison had built outlying forts in Nova Scotia, on debatable land claimed by both nations. To the west, the fortress of Frontenac (now Kingston) alike commanded Lake Ontario, and guaranteed Quebec against an attack down the St. Lawrence. To the south, hundreds of miles of pathless

forest separated the French from the English settlements, broken only by the chain of lovely lakes and rivers which connect the Hudson and the St. Lawrence. Along this waterway two spots were fortified—Crown Point on Lake George, Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain; and round these clearings perished many Englishmen, not only in the war with France, but in the subsequent unhappy conflicts with our provincial brethren.

Braddock's Disaster.

The British plans for the American campaign of 1755 were ambitious. Braddock, with a force of regular and provincial troops, was to reduce Fort Duquesne; while colonial leaders with colonial troops were to capture the French forts in Nova Scotia, to threaten Lake Champlain, and occupy Niagara. To follow the varying fortunes of these minor expeditions would take too long; they served but to distract the attention of our enemy from the serious business of the year, the attack on Fort Duquesne. After long delays, caused by the apathy and greed of some of the provincials, Braddock succeeded in collecting the transport for his expedition. In May he started with 2,200 men on his ill-omened march to the Ohio. Two regiments of British infantry should have lent his force solidity; his contingent of sailors should have supplied the handiness too often lacking in the soldier: his provincial troops should have furnished invaluable local knowledge. But Braddock was doomed to failure. Franklin thus describes him: "He had too much self-confidence; too high an opinion of the validity of regular troops; too mean a one of both Americans and Indians." In a word, he was an average specimen of the regimental officer of the period—brave as a lion, but absolutely ignorant of everything beyond the mere forms of his profession, the spirit of which he was utterly unable to comprehend. He insulted his colonial officers; he neglected his friendly Indians; he alienated a band of desperadoes well versed in frontier fighting, who offered him their services as scouts. His march was most arduous—for the most part through pathless woods. Three hundred axemen were employed in hewing down the trees to make a track twelve feet in width, along which his column, often four miles long, dragged its slow length. After two months of incessant fatigue the expedition approached Fort Duquesne.

When within a few miles of his destination Braddock took the precautions usual in Europe for troops moving through a forest in an enemy's country. He threw out an advance- and rear-guard, and protected his column by flanking parties. But he would not trust the provincials in the advance-guard, though many of them had experience of Indian warfare. He kept them in the rear, and sent to the vanguard raw lads from England, who had never seen a Red Indian in their lives. Suddenly part of the garrison of Fort Duquesne, ambushed in the woods, attacked the British troops, and our men began to fall rapidly. Braddock wheeled into line with great precision, and fired volleys into the forest against his invisible assailants, who, hidden by the trees, picked off the red-coats at their leisure. The soldiers, wiser than their chief, attempted to extend into skirmishing order, and to take cover behind the trees. Braddock rushed at them and drove them into a mass, to be shot down by the enemy. Washington hurried up from the rear with his Virginia militia, and rapidly extended them; but Braddock, who preferred death to the idea of fighting in Indian fashion, fell upon the provincials with his sword drawn, and beat them into a solid formation, an easy target for the Canadians' bullets. In troops thus handled panic was inevitable. The men huddled together like sheep, fired upon each other in their terror, then broke and fled. Happily, there was little pursuit; the Indians were too busy scalping the dead and wounded to follow up the victory, and without their Indian allies the French could not move. Our losses in this eighteenth-century Isandhlwana are variously estimated; one reliable authority places them as high as 139 officers and 914 men killed or wounded. Of our antagonists only sixteen white men fell; the number of Indians hit by our wild fire is unknown.

It has often been asked why the provincials, who infinitely outnumbered the French, did not with one great effort conclude the war. The reason is that Canada had a highly centralised government; the whole of her population was trained to arms; from France she received liberal supplies of soldiers, of selected officers, and of warlike stores. The British colonies, on the other hand, were a collection of semi-republics, more interested in thwarting their governors than in fighting the French, more excited about a trade squabble with

the neighbouring province than in the expulsion of France from the continent of North America. The generals sent from England were too often of the type of the Earl of Loudon. Of him the New Englanders, who suffered much at his hands, bitterly said that he was like St. George on a tavern sign, "always riding on, but never getting anywhere." Everything he touched he mismanaged. His land operations against Montcalm on Lake Champlain in 1756, and his combined naval and military expedition against Louisbourg in 1757, were equally abortive. In 1759 he was replaced by Abercrombie, as great a nonentity as himself.

In 1756 war was openly declared between France and England. A year later we lost Minorca; and an invasion of Britain appeared imminent. But Pitt's accession to power inaugurated a vigorous policy. To occupy the French at home, ten thousand troops, with sixteen ships of the line and other vessels, were despatched to the Bay of Biscay to operate against the naval station of Rochefort. Much might have been accomplished by this great armament; but delays, divided opinions, friction between the generals, antagonism between the army and the navy, brought the expedition to naught. It was a repetition of the *fiasco* of Carthagena without the attendant loss of life.

In the course of the summer of 1757 in North America, things went badly for England. Our garrison at Fort William Henry, near Lake Champlain, surrendered to Montcalm, the newly arrived French general, who guaranteed that on their march back to the nearest British fort the English should be protected by an escort of French troops against the violence of the Indian allies of the victors. No sooner had our people left the fort than numbers of "braves" swarmed into it, and slaughtered the wounded in the hospital before the eyes of the French surgeons, powerless to arrest this carnage. The main body of the prisoners were under the nominal protection of a French guard, who, however, allowed the savages to roam about "plundering and insulting the English, grinning like fiends as they handled, in anticipation of the scalping knife, the long hair of cowering women, of whom there were many in the camp." Next day, as the prisoners were being marched away, escorted by Canadian militia—themselves nearly as savage as their Indian comrades—they were surrounded by

large numbers of warriors, who suddenly fell upon the column, tomahawk in hand. Unchecked by the Canadians, the savages killed and scalped many of the men, captured many of the women, and hurried back to Montreal with 200 miserable prisoners of both sexes, upon whom nameless horrors were inflicted. Men were burned to death over slow fires: they were cut up and cooked, and their wretched comrades compelled to consume this revolting food: mothers were forced to eat the flesh of their own children. At length the French ransomed the prisoners from their allies, of whom, it would appear, they themselves were not a little afraid. Very soon a large number of these warriors were dead, the victims of their own excesses. When Fort William Henry surrendered, they dug up the bodies in the graveyard, to scalp and eat them; but, as small-pox had been prevalent among the garrison, the Indians paid dearly for their cannibal feast.

In 1758 our operations in America were on a large scale. Abercrombie was in nominal command of the troops assembled near Lake Champlain for the invasion of Canada; but the real leader of the expedition was Lord Howe, his Chief of the Staff, a brilliant young man, the idol of both regulars and provincials. To qualify himself for forest warfare he had accompanied the best partisan leaders in their raids against the French; and from the experience thus acquired he introduced many reforms among the English troops. "He made officers and men throw off all useless encumbrances, cut their hair close, wear leggings to protect them from briars, brown the barrels of their muskets, and carry in their knapsacks thirty pounds of meal which they cooked for themselves; so that, according to an admiring Frenchman, they could live for a month without their supply trains."* His death in a skirmish paralysed the feeble Abercrombie; and while he vacillated, Montcalm rapidly entrenched himself at Ticonderoga. His handy troops threw up a strong stockade of logs, strengthened by a formidable abattis of forest trees. Such works, held by resolute men, are almost impregnable by infantry, yet against them Abercrombie blindly rushed. He did not seek to turn the enemy's flank, or to threaten his communications with the St. Lawrence. He did not even bring up his artillery, but he

Ticonderoga.

* Parkman, "Montcalm and Wolfe," ii. 90.

formed his men into "columns of attack," and hurled them against the French. The battle lasted six hours. Six times did the regulars and provincials resolutely advance, six times were they held as in a vice by the abattis, while the French marksmen picked them off from the shelter of the stockade. All the men fought well; one Highland regiment left half its strength on the ground; but the efforts of the troops were in vain. The victory was to Montcalm; with 3,600 Frenchmen he repulsed 15,000 Britons, of whom about 2,000 were killed or wounded. But elsewhere we were successful. Fort Duquesne, on the Ohio, fell into our hands, and was renamed Pittsburg, in honour of the great Minister. A dashing raid on Frontenac (Kingston) destroyed the French naval power on Lake Ontario. Louisbourg, to the intense joy of all Englishmen, was again wrested from the French. Pitt, who after the Rochefort failure had determined to appoint his generals by selection and not by seniority, confided to two young men the conduct of this important siege. Amherst, who had made his name in Germany, was in command. Wolfe, the only soldier who had won renown in the Rochefort expedition, ranked second to him. Boscawen, the admiral, worked hand in glove with the generals. The sailors and the soldiers shared the dangers of the enterprise, and reaped the laurels of the capture of Louisbourg with 5,600 prisoners. Never in our history was the vital necessity that England should command the sea more aptly illustrated than during this expedition. The French fitted out two great fleets to relieve the garrison, but neither of them succeeded in crossing the ocean. The squadron from Toulon was imprisoned in the Mediterranean by our fleet, which, based upon Gibraltar, denied them the Atlantic. The ships from Rochefort were encountered by part of our Channel squadron and driven on the rocks, close to the harbour from which they had sailed.

Second Capture of Louisbourg.

The fall of Louisbourg opened the St. Lawrence, and Pitt decided on his operations for next year. Amherst was sent to succeed Abercrombie in command of the troops, who were to force their way to Canada by the valley of Lake Champlain. Wolfe, at the head of a combined naval and military force, was to make England mistress of Quebec, the virgin fortress of the North. Twice before had an English armament

attempted to reduce the city. In 1690 the gallant men of Massachusetts, after conquering Nova Scotia, sailed up to Quebec, but were beaten back. Twenty-one years later a force of many British ships and nine battalions of infantry was miserably wrecked on the shoals of the St. Lawrence.

Wolfe at Quebec.

It was late in June, 1759, before Wolfe had reached Quebec; and even his gallant heart must have sunk as he realised the difficulties of the task before him. Built on a high grey rock, Quebec, like an inland Gibraltar, rises sheer out of the vast basin formed by the junction of two mighty rivers at its feet. From the south-west the St. Lawrence, at this point little more than a mile wide, rolls past the city. To the north-west the St. Charles served as a great "wet ditch" in front of the fortifications of Quebec. Steep cliffs rise from the river to the plateau behind the town; and these for several miles were watched by a strong detachment under Bougainville. To attack Quebec from the St. Lawrence appeared impossible: to do so from the St. Charles seemed equally hopeless. Montcalm lay entrenched with 14,000 men along the northern shores of the great basin; his right flank rested on the St. Charles, his left on the falls of the Montmorenci. Until he could be dislodged, Quebec seemed impregnable. To out-manœuvre Montcalm, to drive him away or to compel him to give battle, was Wolfe's object during many weeks. But Montcalm was playing a waiting game. He knew that Amherst was making very slow progress on Lake Champlain, and he intended to keep Wolfe at arm's length till the approach of autumn should compel the English to abandon operations for the year.

Early in September Wolfe decided, as a last expedient, to assail Quebec from the westward. By feigned attacks he distracted Montcalm's attention while troops were secretly marched along the southern bank of the river to a creek some miles above Quebec. Here our ships, which had driven the French vessels before them, lay in readiness. As soon as the weather permitted the men were hurried on board, and under the cover of the night the flotilla dropped down the stream on the ebbing tide. At length Wolfe stopped his boat at a spot where his keen eye had a few days previously detected a rough track up the face of the cliff. The vanguard disembarked; silently they scaled the height

and drove off a French outpost left to watch this spot. Soon reinforcements came up. By the morning about 4,000 men had crossed the river without serious molestation from the enemy, and had gained the heights of Abraham, which command Quebec from the rear. Wolfe's position was most critical. With incredible daring he had thrust himself between two hostile armies; behind him were gathering the scattered forces of Bougainville: in front lay Quebec, with 2,000 men crowded behind its fortifications; and through its gates were pouring the troops of Montcalm, whom Wolfe had thus at length compelled to fight. The odds were heavily against us, but the battle did not last long. The steady volleys of the British demoralised the enemy, the vigour of their bayonet charges overthrew them. In the moment of victory Wolfe, pierced by three bullets, fell mortally wounded. As he lay dying on the ground one of the men with him exclaimed "They run, they run!" "Who run?" gasped Wolfe. "The enemy, sir." Wolfe roused himself to give the order to cut off their retreat; then, turning on his side, he murmured, "Now, God be thanked, I will die in peace."

Almost at the same moment fell Wolfe's worthy antagonist, the valiant Montcalm; and with him died all hopes of a successful French defence. "Never was rout more complete than that of our army," wrote a French official. Quebec surrendered, and ten English battalions, the nucleus of the force which next year completed the conquest of Canada, remained to garrison it.

During the remainder of the war Pitt sent expeditions to many parts of the world. We took Havana, in the West Indies; Manila, in the Philippine Isles; Belleisle, off the coast of France. But by the Treaty of Paris (p. 186) all three were surrendered. Seven years later, hostilities with Spain nearly broke out again over the Falkland Islands. Attention had been drawn to their value in case of a war with Spain by the narrative of Anson's voyage; and a British expedition to them had been planned in 1748, but countermanded on the protest of the Spanish ambassador. In 1765 they were taken possession of, on behalf of the Crown, by Captain Byron, the British claim being based on the alleged prior discovery of them by Davis in 1592 and by Hawkins in 1594. In 1766 a small garrison was placed there, which

was ordered off by the Spaniards in 1769, and forcibly expelled by a Spanish fleet in June, 1770. A British squadron was hastily equipped (p. 212), but after much negotiation, the Spanish Government gave way and consented to restore the garrison. The dispute, however, naturally intensified Spanish feeling against England, and helped to prepare for the renewal of hostilities nine years later (pp. 187, 206).

In the American War of Independence, the first blood was shed near Boston in April, 1775. The same restless energy which, in happier times, had led Massachusetts to fight in the quarrels of the mother country with France and Spain, now showed itself in active preparations for civil war. The Bostonians raised a large militia, and at Concord, a village about twenty miles from Boston, collected the supplies necessary for their equipment. To destroy the stores, Gage, who commanded the king's troops in Boston, sent a strong detachment. The expedition was to have been a surprise, but someone at headquarters babbled; and the troops only accomplished the object of their march after a skirmish with a body of militia whom they found ready to resist them at Lexington. As soon as the stores were burned they hurried homeward, to find that the whole country-side had turned out against them. Every house, every tree, every fence sheltered a marksman, who strove to pick off the soldiers as they ran this gauntlet of fire. So utterly exhausted were our men by their retreat that they were "obliged to lie down for rest on the ground, their tongues hanging out of their mouths, like dogs after a chase." The sight of British regulars hastily retiring before the Massachusetts militia so elated the New Englanders that in a short time 20,000 men had collected round Boston, waiting an opportunity to harass the royal troops. Their chance soon came. To the north of Boston, separated from it by the River Charles, rises the eminence of Bunker's Hill. Although this height dominated the British camp, Gage disdained to occupy it, until by a daring night march the provincials seized it at midnight and roughly fortified it by dawn. Then indeed he moved; about 2,000 men were hastily thrown across the river, and formed in two lines for the attack. Burdened with three days' provisions, a knapsack, cartouche box, ammunition, firelock, and bayonet (a

The Fight at Lexington.

Bunker's Hill.

weight stated by Stedman, a military historian of the war, to have reached the almost incredible weight of 125 lbs.), the troops slowly toiled up the slippery hill under so incessant and so destructive a blaze of musketry that twice they recoiled before it. Then professional spirit reasserted itself: they would not be beaten by militiamen, and, with fierce shouts and levelled bayonets, they stormed the breastwork and drove the provincials down the slope. So deadly was the aim of the colonial riflemen that nearly half the British troops engaged in the attack fell on the field of this Pyrrhic victory.

After Bunker's Hill a spell seemed to fall upon General Gage. Without a struggle he allowed Washington, now in supreme command of the provincial forces, to blockade the English in Boston and to throw up batteries which commanded the town. In March, 1777, the bombardment commenced; and then Gage awoke to the fact that he must either dislodge the Americans from their new works or evacuate the town. To capture these works was most difficult, "for the British troops must have ascended an almost perpendicular eminence, on the top of which the Americans had prepared hogsheads chained together in great numbers and filled with stones, to roll down upon them as they marched—a curious provision, by which whole columns would have been swept off at once." Gage therefore determined to abandon Boston to the provincials, and with difficulty embarking his large garrison, reached Halifax, Nova Scotia, in safety.

Late in the summer the English resumed operations. An expedition was sent to the neighbourhood of New York, composed of the troops from Halifax and reinforcements from England. Among the latter were large numbers of Hessians, whose cruel exactions embittered the spirit of the provincials against us. Various engagements took place; the trained and disciplined valour of the professional soldiers won victories, the fruits of which were often lost by the supineness of their leaders. Throughout the war the plans of our generals, conceived without intelligence, were executed without energy. Thus Washington, who should have been annihilated at Staten Island, was allowed to escape to the mainland after a mere defeat. His exploit affords an interesting illustration of the ineptitude of our troops during the American War. Washington was hemmed into the corner of the island by a British

force superior in number to the raw provincial levies whom he commanded. His position was desperate, for his provisions were nearly exhausted, his ammunition was spoilt, his men were disheartened, and at any moment a change of wind might cut off his retreat by placing the British fleet between New York and himself. Secretly he collected a flotilla of boats and cutters, and on board these at dead of night he commenced to embark his troops, 9,000 strong: by dawn he had succeeded in evacuating the island and in reaching the mainland, undetected by the British army. The fact that the American covering-parties heard the sound of digging in our outposts proves that some, at least, of our soldiers were not asleep on duty, and renders it even more inexplicable that the noise of the embarkation should have been unnoticed by our pickets. "Neither the deep murmur in the camp, nor the plash of oars on the river, nor the ripple under the sailing boats" attracted the attention of our look-out men, until at four o'clock the alarm was given that the Americans were in full retreat. Even then, according to Bancroft, several hours elapsed before the officers thought it necessary to send into the now empty camp a solitary patrol, to verify this astounding intelligence! Yet, on the whole, the campaign was in our favour. By the winter New York was occupied, Washington was driven into Pennsylvania, and a scheme was prepared for a serious attack upon New England, the heart and brain of the rebellion. From Canada, General Burgoyne was to make his way, by the Lake Champlain route, to the Hudson; General Clinton was to push up that river from New York; at Albany the forces were to join hands, and thus cut off the New Englanders from the rest of the insurgent provinces; while to distract Washington's attention from the north, Howe was to attack him in Pennsylvania. The summer of 1777 saw the partial execution of this design. Howe sailed to the Chesapeake, landed in Pennsylvania, worsted Washington at Brandywine creek, and took Philadelphia. Thus the minor operation succeeded; but the real object of the campaign, the attack on New England, resulted in one of the most crushing defeats which the British army have ever experienced—a defeat in which the one redeeming feature is that it was inflicted upon us not by foreigners but by men of our own race and language.

The Surrender at Saratoga,

Burgoyne's expedition was composed of 7,000 infantry, half of whom were Germans, a detachment of artillery, and a corps of Canadian axemen. In addition to these white men were the Braves, warriors of the Indian nations with whom Great Britain had stooped to ally herself. It was less than twenty years since England had learned, by bitter experience on the Canadian and Virginian frontiers, that, in the words of Chatham, "the Red man is a cannibal savage, torturing, murdering, roasting, and eating the mangled victims of his barbarous battles." Yet she did not now hesitate to employ the wielders of the tomahawk and the scalping-knife in her efforts to coerce the New Englanders into subjection.

After a first success upon Lake Champlain in July, nothing went well with Burgoyne. October found him entrenched in the forest near Saratoga, to the west of the River Hudson. His supplies were exhausted, his communications with Canada lost; he was surrounded by a superior force of Americans, deeply enraged at the outrages which his Indians had committed. To retreat was impossible; his only hope lay in a vigorous attack upon the enemy. With 1,500 men he flung himself upon the left flank of the American line. The men fought well, but were hopelessly outnumbered. Gates, the American general, not only thrust Burgoyne reeling back, but, hotly pursuing him to his camp, burst into that portion of it occupied by the Germans, and held it so resolutely that evening still found the provincials in possession. In the night Burgoyne retreated; but he could not go far. Hemmed in on every side by an enemy too wise to accept the battle he constantly offered; with his men starving from hunger and dying from disease; with no reliable information of the position of Clinton's co-operating force, Burgoyne had no alternative but to surrender. By the irony of fate, on the very night that the capitulation was signed, a message was received from Clinton to report that his advance-guard had arrived within fifty miles of Saratoga. But the news came too late. The surrender was effected, and 5,700 troops in the service of George III., about 3,000 of whom were Englishmen, laid down their arms to the victorious New Englanders.

The surrender at Saratoga lost to England the colonies of

North America. France, ever anxious to pay off old scores against us, saw in our defeat a golden opportunity; she recognised the independence of the United States, and declared war against England on their behalf. Spain, longing for an opportunity to recover Gibraltar, followed the French example. If England had been unable to vanquish her rebellious colonists while her command of the sea was undisputed, how could she now hope to do so while fighting her two hereditary enemies in Europe? The Ministry blundered on in America, winning an occasional trick, but always beaten on the rubber. Their plan—if plan there was—seems to have been to keep an army at New York, from which to maintain strong detachments in the Carolinas and in Virginia. In 1781 our harsh conduct in North Carolina had so alienated the inhabitants, that even the Loyalists rejoiced to see Cornwallis retire northwards towards Virginia. There our troops, under the mistaken policy of bleeding the rebellion to death, did enormous damage, estimated at two millions sterling. At first Cornwallis was unopposed; but when the militia arrived to reinforce the United States regular troops, he retired towards the coast; and in October he had been driven to the peninsula of Yorktown, at the mouth of the York River, on the coast of Virginia. Here he hastily entrenched himself, hoping against hope that our fleet from New York would rescue him. But England had lost the command of the sea. A strong French fleet from the West Indies not only brought to the Franco-American army a welcome reinforcement of 3,000 men, but it kept our relieving squadrons at bay; and when at length our naval reinforcements arrived, they came too late. To defend his unfinished works at Yorktown Cornwallis had only 7,000 men. Washington commanded 16,000 troops, of whom 7,000 were French veterans. The English general fought till his guns were dismounted, his shells expended, and then surrendered. One of the terms of the capitulation was that the English troops should march out of Yorktown with bands playing, so a bandmaster selected an air, the title of which admirably expressed the feelings of Cornwallis' army—"The World's turned upside down!" With the surrender of Cornwallis the struggle in America practically ceased; and the military interest of the

and at Yorktown.

war shifts from the shores of North America to the Straits of Gibraltar. Here Elliott triumphantly maintained his post during the weary years of the great siege. From July, 1779, when the first shot was fired, until the virtual suspension of hostilities in January, 1783, the garrison suffered terribly. Food constantly ran short; whatever provisions were thrown in by the fleet were necessarily salt, so that the troops were consumed by scurvy from the want of fresh meat. The bombardment was steadily maintained, and on one occasion raged without intermission for six weeks. During the spring of '81 the Franco-Spanish army fired 56,000 shot and 20,000 shells into the town, but without shaking the courage of the troops. Late in that year Elliott made a brilliant sortie. At dead of night he surprised the enemy's lines, spiked many guns, and destroyed many batteries. So utterly unexpected was the attack, that in one of the casemates was found the report of a Spanish officer, written in advance for the morrow. In it he stated that nothing remarkable had occurred during the night! The obstinacy of the defence roused the greatest interest in Europe; and so much exasperated the allied sovereigns, that they offered for public competition prizes for the best plans for the capture of the Rock. A scheme for a combined attack by land and sea was adopted; and the French were confident of success. In September, 1782, the supreme effort was made. After several days' preliminary bombardment, the allied fleet of forty-seven ships of the line, numerous frigates, and ten floating batteries anchored within 1,200 yards of the sea face of the Rock. Their fire was terrific, and was continued by the batteries erected to attack the Rock from the Spanish territory. To reply to the 500 guns which were in action against them, the garrison could only fire 96 pieces; but the red-hot shot with which we unceasingly plied the enemy utterly demoralised them. After eight hours the bombardment began to slacken off; the floating batteries were burned or sunk; the grand attack had failed, and from the summit of the Rock the British flag still waved. A few days later reinforcements arrived, and no further operations of importance took place during the rest of the war.

The Great Siege of Gibraltar.

By the Treaty of Peace in 1783, England acknowledged the

independence of the United States. She ceded to France St. Lucia and Tobago, some posts in India and on the west coast of Africa; but in exchange she received several islands in the West Indies. She restored Florida and Minorca to Spain. It was peace, but—except for the Navy and for the garrison of Gibraltar—not peace with honour.

THE multitudinous naval events of a period which witnessed the services of such great men as Hawke, Anson, Boscawen, Hughes, and Rodney, and such distinguished ones as Byron, Pocock, Watson, Byng, Knowles, Balchen, Norris, and Warren, cannot be even catalogued here. It was an age of brilliant successes, but also, like the age of Anne, of some regrettable failures, due in a few instances to incapacity, but, in the majority, either to personal jealousies or to official red-tapeism. Of the numerous courts-martial, the most celebrated are those which resulted from the actions of Vice-Admiral Thomas Mathews, off Toulon in 1744, and of Vice-Admiral the Hon. John Byng off Minorca in 1756. Mathews was condemned and broken for having given too liberal an interpretation to the rather hide-bound rules which then regulated the conduct of a naval action; Byng was condemned and shot for having too literally obeyed the regulation; and it cannot now be believed by the unprejudiced student that either Mathews or Byng deserved their severe punishment. A curious episode, which occurred during the trial of Vice-Admiral Richard Lestock, Mathews's quarrelsome second in command, who was acquitted, deserves notice, since it is often justly cited as an illustration of the supremacy of the civil power even where the services are concerned. While the court-martial was sitting, its president, Rear-Admiral Perry Mayne, was arrested in virtue of a writ of *capias* issued by the Court of Common Pleas. The members, very indignant, passed severe and disrespectful resolutions directed against Lord Chief Justice Willes, and forwarded them, with a remonstrance, to the Admiralty. The King was ill-advised, and directed the Duke of Newcastle to write to the Lords of the Admiralty "that his Majesty expressed great displeasure at the insult offered to the court-martial," etc.;

W LAIRD CLOWES. The Navy.

Naval Law.

but the Lord Chief Justice, a lawyer of sound learning, and a man of determined will, immediately caused the arrest of every member of the court-martial, and was about to take legal proceedings to maintain the dignity and authority of his office, when the officers submitted, and tendered in writing a most humble and yet a most honourable and manly apology.

Naval Personnel.

It may be interesting, while dealing with the subject of naval *personnel*, to give here some idea of the fluctuations in the number of men annually voted for the service of the Royal Navy from the year of the Revolution to that of the accession of George III. The number in 1689 was only 7,000. Then it gradually increased to 40,000, at which it remained from 1694 to 1697, falling in 1698 to 10,000, rising again in 1699 to 15,000, and once more falling in 1700 to 7,000. In 1701 it rose to 30,000, and in 1702 to 40,000, where it remained till 1712. It was then gradually reduced to 10,000, and after some fluctuations again fell in 1722 to 7,000. Thenceforward it increased to 20,000 in 1727, and fell to 8,000 in 1732–3, mounting to 20,000 in 1734, and to 30,000 in 1735. Again it fell during the peace, to rise to 35,000 in 1740, and to 40,000 in the years 1741–48. The consequent peace saw the usual reduction, the numbers reaching the minimum of 8,000 in 1751; but the year 1756 saw 50,000 men voted; and this number, great though it was, increased to 70,000 in 1760. Such wide fluctuations naturally, on the one hand, put the Admiralty to great difficulty in finding men, and, on the other, caused the men immense hardships; and, as a result, attempts, unhappily ineffectual, were made in 1739, and again in 1749, to revive the Register Act. But the lot both of officers and men was considerably improved during the period. For example, half-pay was granted to senior surgeons in 1729; a corporation for the relief of poor widows of sea-officers was established in 1732, the King contributing £10,000 to it; the Sick and Hurt Office was reorganised in 1740; in the same year the impressing of men above fifty or under eighteen, and of all persons in the first years of their sea-service was forbidden; established rank and uniform were conceded to officers in 1747; an attempt to subject half-pay officers to maritime law was defeated in 1749; and the Marine Society, for the education of orphan or friendless boys for the Navy, was instituted in 1756.

Some allusion has already been made to the work of the Board of Longitude, and to the time-keeping inventions of Mr. Harrison. Further progress in the direction of the discovery of a method for finding the longitude at sea was made soon after the accession of George III. In 1761 the Lords of the Admiralty ordered Captain Dudley Digges, of the *Deptford*, 50, to take on board Mr. Harrison and one of his instruments, and to proceed on an experimental cruise. The ship made first Madeira, and subsequently Jamaica, at the exact times indicated by the chronometer. Harrison returned home in the *Merlin*, and reached Portsmouth after more than four months' absence, to find that his instrument, notwithstanding the very bad weather which had been encountered, had lost only 1 min. 54·5 secs., a result far exceeding anything that had before been attained. Another trial was made in 1764, on board the *Tartar*, Captain John Lindsay. Between March 28th, when she left Spithead, and April 19th, when she reached Madeira, the instrument maintained, as nearly as could be discovered, absolute correctness, and after a further voyage to Barbadoes, and return in a merchant vessel, which enabled Mr. Harrison to reach London on July 18th, the gain amounted to only 54 secs. The Board of Longitude took another important step in 1765, when the marine table, invented by Mr. Witchell, for finding the longitude at sea by the lunar method, was considered and approved. A sum of a thousand pounds was advanced in order to enable this inventor to carry his plans into execution, and, aided by Mr. Isaac Lyons, jun., Mr. Wales, and Mr. Mapson, Mr. Witchell laid the foundations of the scheme which, thanks mainly to the Rev. Dr. Nevil Maskelyne, then Astronomer Royal, bore fruit, in 1767, in the publication of the first number of the *Nautical Almanac*. In proof of the marvellous amount of labour expended upon that complicated and invaluable work, it may be mentioned that in the annual issues of the following half-century only a single error was discovered—even that one being quite unimportant—and that the great astronomer Lalande was able to write of it, "*On en a fait à Bologne, à Vienne, à Berlin, à Milan; mais le* Nautical Almanac *de Londres est l'éphéméride la plus parfaite qu'il y ait*

Scientific Navigation.

The "Nautical Almanac."

jamais eu." Maskelyne did much else during his long life but the creation of the *Nautical Almanac* remains his greatest title to fame. He himself conducted it for forty years.

The earlier part of the reign of George III. is an especially interesting and important period in British naval history, if only because it witnessed the professional training and education of the officers who were destined to bring the British Navy to its highest pitch of glory. The Peace of 1763—a date but seven years previous to that at which Nelson entered the service—seems, in fact, to mark a dividing-line between the older era, when tactics were still crude and conventional, and the newer one, when the genius and initiative of individuals began to have fuller play and to exert greater weight. To Lord Hawke, who in some respects at least must be considered as the best of our naval commanders, belongs the credit of having shown the way to a better order of things. His career overlapped, on the one hand, the unfortunate days of Byng and of Mathews, and, on the other, the glorious ones of Nelson, of Collingwood, and of Saumarez. And, as he was First Lord of the Admiralty from 1766 to 1771, and was for years, both before and afterwards, very influential in the naval councils of the nation, his hand may be detected in many of the reforms of what may be called a transition period. Apart from reforms which were merely administrative, there were several material ones which, as having a bearing upon the general welfare of the Navy, deserve attention.

Beginning of a New Era.

It was in 1761 that the experiment of coppering a ship's bottom was first tried with a British man-of-war. The vessel was the 32-gun frigate *Alarm*, which had been built at Harwich in 1758. Within five-and-twenty years of that time ships of all classes in the Navy were coppered, for it soon became apparent, not only that the process preserved the planking, but also that it very largely improved the sailing qualities. The plates of copper were applied over sheets of thick paper of a peculiar toughness, by means of countersunk nails. So efficacious was the coppering in the case of the *Alarm* that when the frigate was broken up in 1812 her bottom timbers were still remarkably sound, whereas uncoppered ships of her

Material Improvements.

date and build commonly became hopelessly wormed in ten or fifteen years, or in even less in hot climates. Lead had been previously tried as a preservative, but not with much success. Another innovation of the period was the introduction to ships of war of the chain-pump as improved and adapted for the service by Mr. William Cole. It was taken up, and its use was advocated, by Captain John Albert Bentinck, R.N., and in 1764 it was fitted experimentally to a 60-gun ship. Experiments were continued at intervals until 1768, when, in the *Seaford*, a frigate moored in Portsmouth Harbour, it was found that, with four men working it, it discharged a ton of water in 43·5 secs., whereas the pump previously in use needed seven men to discharge a ton in 76 secs., while it needed 81 secs. for four men to do the work. Moreover, the new pump, when choked with shingle ballast, could be cleared in four minutes, whereas the old machine, when similarly choked, could not be cleared at all until the water had been baled or pumped out of the hold. Cole's pump was therefore adopted, and on countless occasions it rendered the most valuable service.

A yet more valuable innovation, although it was not extensively utilised until a much later date, belongs to the present period. This was the fitting to certain ships of apparatus for producing fresh from salt water. In 1761 Dr. Lind discovered that sea water, distilled without the addition of anything whatsoever, yielded perfectly pure fresh water. An account of this discovery was read to the Royal Society in 1762, and was soon afterwards published by authority of the Admiralty. In 1763 M. Poissonnière, a Frenchman, invented a suitable still for the purpose, and this appears to have been employed in 1773 by Captain the Hon. Constantine John Phipps, of the *Racehorse*, during the famous Polar voyage which young Horatio Nelson took part in. But already another distilling apparatus, the invention of Dr. Irving, had been introduced to the Navy in 1770. It was not intended at the time that ships should ever depend exclusively for their fresh water upon such devices, nor in the eighteenth century were stills very common on board ship; yet as early as 1771 a committee of naval officers reported that, without difficulty, sufficient water for her ordinary purposes might be distilled by any vessel, little more fuel being

requisite than that needed for cooking, and the other usual business of the ship.

Manning the Navy.

The popularity of the Naval Service was increased by the granting of not a few concessions and advantages to officers, to men, and to workers in the dockyards. At the time of the Falkland Islands' scare (p. 200), in 1770, for example, the Government offered a bounty of 30s. a head to able seamen; and many cities and towns offered additional bounties, London offering 40s., Bristol 20s., Montrose 42s., Edinburgh the same, and Aberdeen and Lynn each 21s. In 1773, again, the Government bounties were, for each able seaman, £3, for each ordinary seaman, £2, and for each landsman, £1. And in 1779 the popular enthusiasm, not content with offering bounties, went further. The fine 74-gun ships, *Ganges*, *Carnatic*, and *Bombay Castle*, laid down at that time, and launched a few years later, were built at the cost of the East India Company. Encouragement in other directions was not lacking. In 1763, after the Peace, the Marine Society made arrangements for putting out as apprentices in the Merchant Service, or otherwise providing for the future, of a large number of boys under sixteen years of age discharged with good characters from the Royal Navy. In the same year it was ordered, in response to a petition, that seamen who had deserted, but who had subsequently re-entered and had served with good character, should have the letter "R," signifying "run," removed from against their names on the pay-books of the Navy. In the year following, as an encouragement to the artificers in the Royal dockyards, two per cent. of the men, chosen from those who had served with good character for thirty years, were given pensions of £20 per annum, and in 1771 the percentage was increased to two and a half, and classes for pensions were established; while in 1773, when the King reviewed the fleet at Spithead, his Majesty distributed £1,500 among the artificers, workmen, and labourers of the Dockyard, Victualling Office, and Gun Wharf. In that year, also, the half-pay of captains was increased by 2s. a day; so that thenceforth the half-pay of the thirty seniors stood at 10s., that of the next fifty at 8s., and that of the rest at 6s. At about the same time the number of surgeons entitled to half-pay was increased from 50 to

The Attractions.

100, one-half to receive 2s. 6d. a day and the other half 2s.; and the number of masters similarly entitled was also raised to 100, half, as in the other case, being given 2s. 6d., and half 2s. The position of the masters was further improved in 1779, when the twenty-five senior ones, if properly qualified, became eligible for 3s. 6d., and the next seventy-five for 3s. a day. The surgeons received additional advantages in 1781. Nor should the incorporation, in 1775, of the Hibernian Marine Society, in Dublin, be forgotten. The society was established for maintaining, educating, and apprenticing the orphans and children of decayed seamen of the Royal Navy and of the Merchant Service.

But, after all, the strongest encouragement to the Navy lay in the fact that whenever there was war there was also prize-money for good officers and men who knew how to obtain it. The foundation of many a fine fortune was built upon prize-money; and it will not be uninteresting to print a statement of the disposal of the booty taken on the occasion of the capture of a single Spanish ship, the *Hermione*, in 1762. Few prizes were, of course, so rich as this, but on numerous occasions the sum for division exceeded £100,000. The *Hermione* was taken off Cadiz by the *Active*, 28, Captain Herbert Sawyer, and the *Favourite*, 16, Commander Philemon Pownall, and she made no resistance. The capturing ships belonged to a squadron under Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Saunders and Commodore Sir Piercy Brett, and these lucky officers, therefore, though they were not present, were entitled to share largely; but even after their proportion, amounting to £64,963 3s. 9d., had been deducted, there remained:—

Prize-money.

To Captain Sawyer of the *Active*	£65,053	13	9
To each of the three commissioned officers of the *Active*	13,004	14	1
To each of eight warrant officers of the *Active* ...	4,336	3	2
To each of the twenty petty officers of the *Active*	1,806	10	10
To each of the *Active's* 150 seamen and marines	485	5	4

Thus the entire *Active's* share amounted to £251,020 12s. The *Favourite's* share, she being not entitled to any of the bounty-money, was but £203,181 4s. 3d. The Admiral's share of the Havana prize-money, also won in 1762, was no less than £122,697 10s. 6d., but that was after the capture, not

of a ship only, but of a great naval base, and of all contained in it. As for the *Hermione* treasure, it was conveyed from Portsmouth to London in twenty waggons, decorated with the British colours flying over those of Spain, and was escorted by a party of seamen. At Hyde Park Corner it was received by a troop of Light Horse, which accompanied it thence to the Tower. A spectacle such as that must have sent hundreds of adventurous youngsters away, determined to take up the naval career. But that career had another aspect. The war ended by the Treaty of Fontainebleau, in 1763, was fearfully costly in the matter of life, so costly, indeed, that the statistics, unless they were of an official character, would be absolutely incredible. The number of seamen and marines employed during the campaign was 184,893. Of these only 1,512 were killed in action, or by accident; but in the seven years no fewer than 133,708 men had perished by disease, or were reported missing. Doubtless there were many deserters among the missing, yet, unhappily, it is but too clear that, especially upon some stations, the mortality was shocking. Captains had scarcely begun to take an intelligent interest in sanitary matters.

Drawbacks.

Concerning the social life of the Royal Navy during the first three quarters of the eighteenth century we know much. It seems to be the fashion among some modern naval writers to question the truth of the pictures drawn by Smollett the novelist, on the ground that, since a naval surgeon of those days was only a warrant officer, and since Smollett, while in the Navy, was but a surgeon, he can have known little of life as it was in the "great cabin," and saw his scenes and characters from so great a distance as to be unable to appreciate the true proportion and relative importance of things and persons. But these critics perhaps forget that, though Smollett was a surgeon, he was also one of the keenest observers and most accomplished students of human manners and motives; and that in the eighteenth century the position of a warrant officer was far from being what it now is. The verdict of Thackeray was probably more just than is the verdict of the school alluded to; and Thackeray wrote: "He did not invent much, as I fancy, but had the keenest perceptive faculty, and described what he saw with wonderful relish and delightful broad

The Social Life of the Navy.

humour." Nor can anyone who takes the trouble to compare Smollett's descriptions of naval life with the descriptions left to us by naval officers of executive rank, who enjoyed the honour of a commission, come to any other conclusion than that upon the whole Smollett told the truth, and exaggerated or caricatured astonishingly little. The critics who would refuse to believe Smollett cannot withhold credit from Captain Edward Thompson; yet the latter tells practically the same tale as the former. Here is what Thompson wrote in 1756 to a young relative then about to enter the service, and what he republished time after time when he was himself of maturer years:—

"You now live under the care and protection of a most indulgent parent, where you enjoy all the blessings this world can afford, and his paternal affection. These you must lose immediately on your launching into the sea service, and, though a youth, you will be under the necessity of commencing your own guardian. Here are no back doors through which you can make your escape, nor any humane bosoms to alleviate your feelings. At once you resign a good table for no table, and a good bed for your length and breadth. Nay, it will be thought an indulgence, too, to let you sleep where day ne'er enters, and where fresh air only comes when forced. You must get up every four hours—for they never forget to call you, though you may forget to rise: but when you begin, I wish you to be vigilant and active. Your light for day and night is a small candle, which is often stuck at the side of your platter at meals, for want of a better convenience. Your victuals are salt, and often bad; and if you vary the mode of dressing them, you must cook yourself. I would recommend you always to have tea and sugar; the rest you must trust to, for you'll scarce find room for any more than your chest and hammock, and the latter at times you must carry upon deck to defend you from small shot, unless you keep one of the sailors in fee with a little brandy (which is a good friend at sea): but always drink it mixed with water. . . . Low company is the bane of all young men, but in a man-of-war you have the collected filth of jails; condemned criminals have the alternative of hanging or of entering on board. There's not a vice committed on shore but is practised here; the scenes of horror and infamy on board of a man-of-war are so many and so great, that I think they must rather disgust a good mind than allure it."

Again he wrote:—

"The disagreeable circumstance and situations attending a subaltern officer in the navy are so many and so hard, that had not the first men in the service passed the dirty road to preferment to encourage the rest, they would renounce it to a man. . . . The state of inferior officers in his Majesty's service is a state of vassalage, and a lieutenant's preferment the greatest in it. The change is at once from a filthy maggot to

a shining butterfly. Many methods might be introduced to make the lower officers of more consequence on their duty, and their lives more agreeable to themselves; for the power of reducing them to sweep the decks, being lodged in the breast of a captain, is often abused through passion or caprice. Besides, it is too despotic an authority to exercise on a man who has the feelings of an Englishman. We are likewise to recollect that all commanders of men-of-war are not gentlemen, nor men of education. I know a great part are brave men, but a much greater, seamen. . . The last war, a chaw of tobacco, a rattan, and a rope of oaths were sufficient qualifications to constitute a lieutenant."

It is upon these points that the modern naval critic most often errs when he describes for us the officers of the middle of the eighteenth century. A gentleman himself, though one, too often, of very limited reading, he has always found the great majority of his fellow-officers to be gentlemen also; and it pleases him to think that his forbears in the service were for the most part gentlemen too. Alas! he is wrong. Not only Smollett and Thompson, but a score of other contemporary authorities as well, assure us to the contrary on every page of their writings. The majority of officers, then as now, may have been of gentle birth, but the hideous influences to which they were exposed, beginning at a very tender age, spoilt all but a few of them, and turned them into ruffianly boors, capable enough as seamen, but absolutely unfit to associate with even moderately decent people on shore.

Edward Thompson was one of the comparatively few who not only escaped the general corruption of manners, but who also found opportunity, amid the preoccupations of a tolerably busy sea life, to become an educated man. He appears to have made a voyage to Greenland in a merchantman in 1750, when he was not more than twelve years of age; to have subsequently served the East India Company, to have been pressed into a man-of-war, to have fought as a midshipman in the *Stirling Castle* in Hawke's action with Conflans, and, after various services, to have died as Commodore in the *Grampus* on the West Coast of Africa, in 1786. It was an ordinary enough naval career at that period; but Thompson differed even from the cultivated naval officer of the day in being also an active, if not always an effective, man of letters. He edited the works of Sir John Oldham and of Paul Whitehead the poet; he wrote much both in prose and verse, contributing to the language one of its most charming

sea songs, "The Topsail Shivers in the Wind."* He was the friend of Johnson, Wilkes, Colman, and, indeed, most of the distinguished men of his time, and he was, in addition, a pertinacious diarist. That his journals have never been published in full is owing to the fact that they reveal incidents which are hurtful to the pride of a family in which his blood is perpetuated; but Dr. Henry Hayman, into whose hands some portions of them fell, published a mass of entertaining excerpts from them in 1869. Here are a few that illustrate the naval manners and men of the age:—

"August 16, 1783.—'I took Burgundy and Champagne with Lord Keppel, and gave him a turtle. A mixed company, but neither wit, humour, nor information. Sea captains can't speak with any degree of ease before their superiors.'

"February 13, 1784.—'No place can vary so much in its aspect as Portsmouth—its colours and concubines ragged; the pavement grass-grown; sales of furniture every day; the coffee-house with scarce a marine officer; dilly's† and stages empty in and out; taverns and inns without customers; and yet the prices continue the same.'

"February 15, 1784.—'I paid a visit to Admiral‡ Montague. A coarser, rougher, ruder sea monster never existed.'

"November 28, 1784.—'Lord Rodney set off to France, being ashamed of the evidence he gave on Johnstone's trial against Sutton, which was tantamount to little better than a marine perjury. He gave on oath that he never knew a court-martial held at sea, though he had issued orders for many himself, and at which Lord Hood sat as president.'

"January 23, 1785.—'I passed the day with my friend Jackson, where I met Mr. Masterman and§ Sir Geo. Young. Mr. Masterman ably described that our want of success in the last war arose from the faction of a party among our officers. Sir Sam. Hood§ denied the assistance within his ability to Adm. Graves in the *Chesapeake*, and to Rodney on the 10th of April—for how could his squadron be equally engaged that had few or none killed? The plunder of the public by all was too atrocious, from Sir E. Hughes, in India, to Admiral Arbuthnot, in America, who shared the profits of rapine with his secretary Green, who was known through the fleet to be the most profligate and prostituted knave.'"

In an autobiographical work which Thompson, writing anonymously, published in the *London Magazine* in 1774-75,

* Set by Hook, and later by Arne.

† *I.e.* diligences.

‡ John Montague, then an Admiral of the Blue, and Commander-in-Chief at Portsmouth. Charnock gives him the "reputation of a man possessing the strictest integrity, and a most benevolent heart, unhappily alloyed by some intemperance."

§ Hood's relations with Rodney are fully shown in "Letters written by Sir Samuel Hood" (Navy Records Society, 1895).

there is a very full description of the sea life of the time in a man-of-war. The most characteristic passages are, unfortunately, unquotable; but some account of the officers of the *Stirling Castle* in 1755-56, when she was commanded by Captain (afterwards Admiral Sir) Samuel Cornish, may be cited, since it can scarcely be doubted that the officers were types. The captain of marines appears to have been the most disagreeable of Thompson's fellow-officers:—

"Contradiction was the darling of his tongue and brain, and rudeness and quarrel were his delights. He ever seemed happy to give offence, and a duel was at times a thing he eagerly sought or assiduously shunned, for he had, strictly speaking, his days of fighting and of cowardice. He was an avowed foe to all persons; he made it an invariable rule to affront them wherever he met them. . . . No man could mess with him; he therefore lived in his cabin by himself, a hermit amidst 500 men. He drank much, and grew more unpleasant as the barometer of Bacchus rose; and if any man would risk his head and bones for the sake of his claret he was sure to have enough of his wine and his fists. I once was present at a scene of this sort, where a great company had dined and retired. He and an Irish lieutenant were left the guardians of the empty bottles and glasses. For some time he appeared pleased with his companion, till some assertion in his arguments produced the lie direct. The opprobrious word was replied to with a bottle, and bottle begat bottle; then bowls, plates, glasses, and everything that could be thrown. . . . Such a mixture of cowardice and valour never met in one man. He would fight duels with an appetite; and yet I saw him eat physic nuts in the West Indies, that he might not come to the attack he was ordered to perform: and this man was a soldier, and suffered to be in the King's service. The lieutenants were as motley as they were many. The first was a brave old man of Scotland, who died in an action with a French frigate; the second was a swab, who beat out all the teeth of his black servant with a boot-jack; the third was an empty, drunken fungus, all puff-paste, ignorance, and impertinence; the fourth was an agreeable coxcomb, that could read and write but little, and yet would sit for hours with a folio before him to have the credit of being a student; but he was a smart sailor and a gallant fellow. The parson was a tame, ignorant, moral man; the surgeon was without any knowledge of his profession, and preferred bumbo to every other consideration; the lieutenant of marines was a scholar, and a veteran soldier, that had fought the battle and ably sung the fight. These . . . filled up the list of officers under whom I had the honour to serve in a voyage to New York, where we arrived on August 9th, 1756."

And we may safely conclude that the *Stirling Castle* was officered not very differently from the other 64-gun ships of her day.

After the time of Dampier, the chief English pioneers of maritime discovery are Anson and Cook. The former's voyage, however, was of military interest first and foremost; it was undertaken in consequence of the war between Great Britain and Spain which broke out in 1739 (p. 11), and its object was especially to attack the Spanish possessions in Peru and other parts of South America. Anson's ship, the *Centurion*, which alone persisted to the end, was a 60-gun vessel, manned by over 400 sailors, and with it sailed four other men-of-war, a sloop-of-war, and two victualling ships, September 8th, 1740. The passage to Madeira took forty days, through the hindrance of contrary winds; but the expedition "crossed the Equinoctial" on the 28th November, and sighted the coast of Brazil on the 16th December. Proceeding down the shore of South America, and sounding, as they claimed, more thoroughly than had ever been done before, Anson's fleet, after touching at St. Julian's Bay in Patagonia, escaped an encounter with the Spanish force sent to intercept them, but suffered terribly from stormy weather off the Horn. The day of the passage of Le Maire's Strait was indeed the "last cheerful day the greatest part of the crew ever lived to enjoy." Scurvy attacked the men, and storms shattered the vessels: Anson's ship at last arriving at the rendezvous of Juan Fernandez with only 167 men out of nearly 500. Here he was joined by two other ships of his squadron and made a stay of some time, not without finding curious proofs of Selkirk's occupation "about thirty-two years ago."

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY. Exploration.

Anson's Voyage.

Sufferings of his Crew.

At last, on the 8th September, 1741, the fleet started again, to begin offensive operations against Spain, with crews for the three remaining ships which would have been barely sufficient to man the *Centurion* alone. The only comfort was that "nothing was to be apprehended from the naval power of Spain in this part of the world." Anson set to work at once, therefore, captured several small prizes, stormed Payta, and cruised off Acapulco (February–March, 1742) for the Manilla

Achievements against Spain.

galleon; but, as the sailing of the treasure-ship was put off, he left the American coast in March, 1742, crossed the Pacific, and touched at the Ladrones (August, 1742), where he refitted in the "happy isle" of Tinian. His men had begun to suffer again from the scurvy, and this change on land was invaluable.

Voyage in the Pacific.

While on shore with most of his men, Anson had the misfortune to lose his ship for a time: the *Centurion* was driven from her moorings and lost sight of between the 22nd of September and the 11th of October, 1742. In the interval, Anson, at once resigning himself to a lasting separation, had set about devising a plan to save his men. His method was to haul on shore a small Spanish prize they had taken, saw her asunder, and lengthen her twelve feet, which would enlarge her to near forty tons burden and enable her to carry them all to China. The ship's carpenters were fortunately on shore with their chests of tools; the smith, too, with his forge, but not the indispensable bellows. This had to be improvised: for some time they were puzzled by the want of leather; however, they had hides in plenty, and with a hogshead of lime they found already prepared on shore they tanned a few hides, and a gun-barrel served their hastily-made and strongly-scented bellows for a pipe. The new barque was provisioned with cocoanuts, rice, and jerked beef, and furnished with eighty charges of ammunition—all they could muster—a pocket compass, "little better than the toys made for schoolboys," and a makeshift quadrant. With such indomitable pluck were the difficulties of the position faced and overcome, when the return of the ship again changed the look of things, and on the 21st of October the whole crew left Tinian together, after destroying the vessel constructed with such care. From Tinian Anson made for Macao and, passing by Formosa, reached it on the 12th of November; the river of Canton, off the mouth of which he now lay, was then the only Chinese port frequented by European ships. Here he refitted the *Centurion* after infinite trouble with Celestial officialism, and, returning to the Philippines, captured the Manilla galleon off Cape Espiritu Santo. The

Proposed Escape from Tinian.

Capture of the Manilla Galleon.

prize, valued at near 1,500,000 dollars, was much larger than the *Centurion*, and had 550 men and 64 guns. She was very well furnished with small arms and particularly provided against boarding, but, with all her advantages, she struck after less than three hours' fighting, having 67 killed in the action and 84 wounded, while the *Centurion* had only two killed and seventeen wounded, of whom all but one recovered. "Of so little consequence are the most destructive arms in untutored and unpractised hands."

Returning again to Macao, Anson sold the galleon and set out for England by the Cape of Good Hope. He left the Chinese coast on December 15th, 1743, touched at the Cape on the 11th March, 1744, and escaping with marvellous good fortune a hostile French fleet in the Channel, as he had escaped the intercepting Spanish squadron of Joseph Pizarro off Patagonia, anchored at Spithead (June 15th) after an absence of three years and nine months. The prize-money was transported to London on thirty-two waggons, to the sound of military music; the narrative of the voyage went through four large editions in one year, was translated into seven European languages, and made a greater literary success than any maritime journal of earlier time.

Anson's Return to England.

The interval between Anson and Cook is filled up by the voyages of Byron, Wallis, and Carteret, as well as by some progress in the exploration of North America, which is now beyond the scope of a brief narrative. It may be noted, however, that in 1752 the trustees in whom the colony of Georgia (p. 34) had been vested surrendered their charter to the Crown, and so closed the career of the settlement as a philanthropic enterprise. But the scientific expeditions to the Pacific which immediately preceded Cook do strictly belong to this section, and though now almost entirely forgotten, they were not without results.

Scientific Exploration of the Pacific: Byron.

John Byron, who was sent out in 1764 (2nd July), with the *Dolphin* and *Tamar*, had served under Anson as a midshipman in the *Wager*, and after his shipwreck on the coast of Chili had written that account of his sufferings which his grandson the poet alludes to in "Don Juan," when he wants to

make his hero a more interesting martyr than any in "My grand-dad's Narrative." In his voyage of 1764 to the South Seas he insists particularly on the truth of the Patagonian giants, who had been reduced by some to the ordinary stature of tall men. After taking possession of the Falkland Islands (p. 200) he doubled Cape Horn and stood across the Pacific, skirting the northern side of the Low Archipelago, and discovering some of the northernmost islands of the group. Especially he laid claim to the "Saint George's Islands," found in 14° 5′ S. Latitude, and 145° W. Longitude. But these were small results to what he might have achieved had he zigzagged and quartered over his ground in a systematic pursuit of fresh discoveries. The Society Islands were close by his track, but he seems to have been more anxious to follow Anson's course and to make a record voyage round the world than to increase the knowledge of the Pacific. He returned on May 9th, 1766, after twenty-two months' sail, and it was proudly recorded of him that "no navigator had ever compassed the world in so short a space of time," as if that were the end and object of exploring ventures.

Wallis and Carteret.

Much more satisfactory was the voyage of Wallis and Carteret in the *Dolphin* and the *Swallow* (1766-68). Carteret had been Byron's lieutenant in the voyage of 1764; now in the *Swallow*, after separating from Wallis and the *Dolphin* while clearing Magellan's Straits (April 11th, 1767), he went to refit at Masafuero, and prepared for some real work in the old and long-neglected fashion of "searching out of unknown parts." On July 2nd, 1767, he discovered Pitcairn's Island; thence, sailing in a north-west direction, he fell in with a large number of unnoticed lands on the way to New Guinea, such as the Duke of Gloucester's, Gower's, Simpson's, Carteret's, Hardy's, Wallis's, Leigh's, and Queen Charlotte's Islands. On reaching New Britain, he made an important addition to Dampier's work. St. George's Bay, supposed to be only an inlet, was found to be really a strait dividing New Britain proper from a second country which Carteret called New Ireland. Finally, after discovering and naming the islands of Sandwich, Byron, New Hanover, the Duke of Portland, and several others, he made his way home to England by the Philippines, Java, and the Cape of

Good Hope, and so concluded the most useful exploring voyage that had been made since Dampier's time (March 20th, 1769). Captain Wallis, who brought home an interesting collection of "different instruments used by savages," returned a year before Carteret, having discovered, or resighted, as he claimed, fifteen separate islands, among them the famous Tahiti, first seen by Quiros, "the last of the Spanish heroes," and called by him Sagittaria, but now renamed by the English captain after King George III. His voyage immediately preceded one that has cast back some of its fame to the forerunner whose memory it has preserved.

Cook's First Voyage.

In 1768 the Royal Society persuaded the Government to despatch a vessel to the South Seas, under James Cook, for the purpose of observing the transit of Venus over the Sun's disc, visible at Tahiti. Cook was the son of an agricultural labourer, and had run away to sea from the haberdasher to whom he was apprenticed. He had served as ship's boy on northern coasters, had managed to enter the navy, and had first made himself a name as marine surveyor of the coasts of Newfoundland and Labrador. He was now forty years of age, when greatness was thrust upon him by the offer of the Royal Society. On the 25th August, 1768, he sailed from Plymouth Sound as lieutenant in command of the *Endeavour*, a peaceful ship bound on a peaceful errand—science without filibustering. Charles Green accompanied him as astronomer, Joseph Banks and Solander as naturalists, Buchan as draughtsman, Parkinson as painter. On New Year's Day, 1769, the crews began to complain of cold, as they neared the Horn; on the 11th January they sighted the Falkland Islands, and soon after this, Tierra del Fuego.

His Exploration of the Pacific Islands.

On the 22nd January, 1769, Cook began his passage through Le Maire's Strait; on the 26th he doubled Cape Horn and entered the Pacific. Sailing for several weeks to the westward, he made many of the islands sighted the year before by Bougainville, and discovered others himself. On the 11th April he reached Tahiti, and, anchoring in Port Royal Bay, prepared to land.

On the 3rd of June the transit of Venus was observed, and the ships left on the 13th of the same month. This

visit of Cook's resulted in the first thorough exploration of the most celebrated of all the smaller Pacific islands and of the attendant group, called the Society Islands. The elaborate observations now made upon the habits, government, religion, morals (or immorals), and character of the Tahitians were invaluable for future work, and gave quite an improved conception of the function of an explorer. It was not merely a discovery of new lands, but a complete description of new races, that was now aimed at. Thievish without rascality, licentious without shame and without malice, amiable and confiding to excess, the Tahitians, as Cook found them, were true children of nature.

Visit to New Zealand:

On the 15th August Cook finished his discoveries among the Society Islands, and on the 7th of October arrived off the north-east coast of New Zealand at a point he named Poverty Bay. This great island had been visited in 1642 by Tasman, but had been neglected by explorers since that time. The natives here were found to be very different from the amiable Tahitians. Ferocious cannibals as they were, they threatened their visitors on the latter attempting to land; but Cook coasted in safety the whole eastern shore of the north island, from Cape Turnagain to the North Cape, after which he began descending the western side. By the end of March, 1770, he had circumnavigated both the two main islands of New Zealand, and thus disproved their connection with any great southern continent.

On the last day of March the *Endeavour* left New Zealand, and, sailing west, on the 18th April Lieutenant Hicks sighted land directly ahead, which proved to be the southern point of New Holland, or, as we now call it, Australia. Cook sailed on north along this coast, and on the 21st of April first descried ascending smoke, proving the country to be inhabited. On the 13th May natives were seen on the shore, and a landing was effected; immediately after this, Botany Bay was reached and named, from the collection of plants and flowers made here by Banks and Solander. Escaping from the reef which the ship struck on the 10th June, Cook repaired in Endeavour River, edged the Great Barrier Reef, first from outside and then from inside, and, taking possession

and Australia.

of the whole coast from S. Lat. 38° to 10° in the name of George III., and by the title of New South Wales, entered Torres Straits. Passing between New Guinea and New Holland, now conclusively proved to be different islands, he reached Batavia in Java on the 8th October, losing here by fever and pestilence nearly thirty officers and men out of a crew which had remained perfectly healthy during the voyage. From this point Cook made good speed homewards, and anchored in the Downs on the 12th of July, 1771, after a voyage of three years, which had dwarfed every other discovering venture of the English people for the past hundred years.

Cook's Second Voyage.

He was raised to the rank of commander, and sent out again in search of any traces to be found (or disproved) of the Great Southern Continent, and especially of a certain doubtful Cape Circumcision, supposed to have been sighted by Benoit, the French navigator, in 1709, to the south of the Cape of Good Hope, in S. Lat. 54° and Longitude 11° east. He sailed in charge of two ships, the *Resolution* and *Adventure*, on the 13th July, 1772; and, parting from the Cape of Good Hope on the 22nd November, sought in vain for the imagined land till the 1st February, 1773, by which time he had satisfied himself that Cape Circumcision was nothing more than a point of some great icefield. Crossing the Antarctic Circle, on January 16th, 1773, the *Resolution* lost sight of the *Adventure* on February 8th; on the 17th Cook first noticed the southern counterpart to the Aurora Borealis; but on the 16th of March, while in S. Lat. 59°, and E. Longitude 146°, having beaten along close to the 60th southern parallel from off the Cape of Good Hope to the south of Tasmania, he abandoned for a time the search after a Southern Continent, that was now proved to lie, if existing at all, in latitudes too high for any useful result. On the 26th March, 1773, he anchored at Dusky Bay, close to the most southern point of New Zealand, having sailed 11,000 miles in 117 days, without once seeing land. Proceeding onward to the rendezvous in Queen Charlotte's Sound (New Zealand), where he found the *Adventure* once again on the 18th of May, Cook was in some danger from

Antarctic Exploration.

waterspouts, one of which passed within sixty yards of his ship's stern. With his two vessels he then sailed the Southern Pacific as far as Long. 140° west in search of land between the Latitudes of 41° and 46° south. The huge seas setting from every direction convinced Cook that no land was near, and on the 17th August he made Tahiti. Taking two natives with him, to supply the place of the two he had lost on his first voyage, the commander sailed on to the Friendly Islands early in October, returning to New Zealand in November.*

Further Explorations of the Pacific.

He left the great southern island again in December, 1773, on a last search for the Austral Continent; and on the 23rd had reached Latitude 67°, when he was stopped by ice on the very edge of the Antarctic Circle. So, turning back, he explored the vast tract of unknown sea to the north of this in and about Longitude 130° to 140° without finding any land; and, again crossing into the Tropics, sighted Easter Island on the 11th March, 1774, after 104 days out of sight of land.† Since Roggewein's discovery this had been scarcely visited, but Cook recognised it from the gigantic statues on the coast which the Dutch had described. In April he visited the Marquesas, discovered in 1595 by Mendana, revisited Tahiti and carefully coasted the islands, now re-named the New Hebrides, off the north-east coast of Australia—the Espiritu Santo of Quiros, the Grandes Cyclades of Bougainville. He followed this up with an important discovery—of the great island of New Caledonia; but being unable to get provisions here, he returned to New Zealand; and, after a stay on this coast from the 18th October to the 10th November, left for Cape Horn, to search once more after a Southern Continent in the ocean tracts south of that Cape. On the 21st December he was in Christmas Sound, Tierra del Fuego, and after doubling the Horn, and discovering various small islands in high southern latitudes—especially South Georgia, 14th January, 1775, and, a few days later, Sandwich Land—he reached the Cape of Good Hope on 19th–21st March, 1775, and heard news of the *Adventure*, which had already

Discovery of New Caledonia.

* On the 30th October the two ships separated for the last time.

† On 27th January, 1774, he reached 71° 10′, his furthest point to the south.

passed there on her way home. On the 29th–30th July he landed at Plymouth after three years' absence, and with the loss of only four men—a decisive victory over the scurvy.

His Third Voyage.

Cook's third voyage was primarily an attempt to solve the question of the North-West Passage, as Baffin had resolved to try it in his last days, from the side of Asia. On the 12th July, 1776, he left Plymouth with the *Resolution*, followed on the 10th August by his consort the *Discovery*, under Captain James Charles Clerke. The vessels joined company at the Cape of Good Hope, November 10th. Arriving at Tasmania in December, 1776, he lay in Queen Charlotte's Sound, New Zealand, for a fortnight in February, 1777; he then discovered the Hervey (Cook's) Islands, where he especially noticed and described the natives of Mangaia. In the Society Islands he planted pineapple and melon seeds, restored his Tahitian friend Omai to his home (in Huaheine), and then sailed north for Behring Straits. On the way he discovered, in February, 1778, the islands which he named after the Earl of Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty, and, sailing north-east, struck the coast of America at about the same point where Francis Drake reached his furthest in New Albion in 1579. From this coasting north, he reached Nootka Sound late in March, and renamed it King George's Sound. He left here on the 26th April, and entered a deep inlet of the sea, as he supposed. It proved, however, to be a river, and after following its course 200 miles from the mouth, he left it again on the 5th June, and by the 7th August had reached the western extremity of America, in 66°, which he named Cape Prince of Wales. Thence sailing westward, he was off the coast of Asia by nightfall, having sighted the two continents within one day. On the 12th August, while sailing north, both were in sight at the same moment. Now, however, on passing through Behring's Straits, Cook found himself at the edge of the icefields in 71° north (August 17th). Turning back from this mass, as compact as a wall, twelve feet high and stretching to east and west as far as could be seen, the English retraced their journey

Discovery of Cook's Islands, and the Sandwich Islands.

The North-West Coast of America.

In Behring Sea.

through the Straits, to the island of Oonalaska, south-west of Norton Sound, where they met with three Russian carriers who possessed storehouses and a little sloop of thirty tons, and knew of the past explorations of Kamschatka, Behring, and others in the Russian service.

Cook finally left Behring's Straits on the 26th October, and on the same day of the next month found himself among the Sandwich Islands. He discovered several islands not before noticed, and stayed at Hawaii till the 4th February, 1779, when his vessels started on their way. Compelled by stress of weather to return on the 11th February, he became involved in a contest with the natives through a theft (and consequent scuffle) which happened two days afterwards. He failed to entice the king on board his ship, where he intended to keep him as a hostage, and a skirmish in the harbour in which a chief had been killed, caused the crowd of natives on shore, who had dissuaded their king from going with the English captain, to attack the man they had deified as an Orono a few months before. While Cook faced the mob, no one ventured to strike him, but his own kindness of heart threw away this advantage. He was last seen alive, as he turned round to his men in the boats, ordering them to stop firing, but at this moment he was stabbed in the back and fell face foremost into the water, dead. (February 14th, 1779). After great difficulty and some bloodshed his remains were recovered on the 20th—at least, his hands, skull, thigh and leg bones, and feet, with his gun and shoes. Thus ended the life and work of the greatest explorer of the eighteenth century, one of the most fruitful benefactors of the human race, the true father of our Australian colonies, the finisher of the main tract of oceanic discovery. He was one of the few men who literally rose from the ranks to first-class eminence—a thing much harder and much rarer than common talk would sometimes suggest. Had he returned in safety from his third voyage, it is not hard to believe that rumour would have been right, and that the King, who valued him as he deserved, would have knighted the man whom the French Government, at Turgot's instance, had so honoured by excepting his ship and himself from all hostilities as a "benefactor of every nation." To the last his

Cook's Death.

His Work.

spelling and his writing were elementary; on the other hand, he was a finished surveyor, an excellent mathematician, a heaven-born genius in that science of navigation where genius is, indeed, "the infinite capacity for taking pains."

J. BROWN. Nonconformity, 1689-1815.

THE Act of Toleration of 1689, by granting liberty of worship, gave to Nonconformity in some sense a recognised place among the institutions of the country. Its meeting-houses were henceforth registered, and by this legal formality placed under the protection of the King's courts; property given for religious uses was secured by trust-deeds which were recognised by the legal authorities; and Nonconformist ministers, being duly licensed and solemnly sworn, acquired thereby a quasi-clerical character which secured exemption from serving on juries, or as churchwardens and overseers, to which laymen were liable. On being now free—for the first time since the Restoration—to assert themselves openly as distinct and self-supporting communities, the Nonconformists had all at once to face the necessity of providing themselves with places of worship. During the period of Cromwell's ascendency in religious matters Presbyterian and Independent ministers were under no such necessity, they being gradually put in possession of national benefices as vacancies arose on death or deprivation. But now, on receiving liberty of conscience under William III., there were no churches for them to occupy beyond the few built during the time of persecution, or under the Declaration of Indulgence. From the Restoration to the Revolution, their meetings were either suspended, or held in the open air or in private buildings. The first thing, therefore, to do now was to provide local habitation for their communities and their principles. To this they addressed themselves with considerable energy. From a parliamentary return (1853, No. 156; p. 240), we find that from 1688 to 1690 no fewer than 939 places of meeting were registered; in the next ten years 1,279 more were added, and by 1720 the number had increased to 4,374. The great majority of these were mere temporary buildings, such as houses, barns, rooms, registered to be used while more

The Recognition of Dissent.

Places of Worship.

permanent meeting-houses were being erected. In 1715 Daniel Neal obtained a return of the number of Free Churches in England and Wales, which he gives as 1,150; but as this merely includes Independents and Baptists, and takes no note of Quakers, who had eighty permanent communities in Yorkshire alone, or of Presbyterians, who had from thirty to forty congregations in Lancashire, and were numerous in some other counties, the list is evidently defective. We shall probably not be far from correct if we state that in the quarter of a century which had elapsed between the accession of William III. and the death of Queen Anne, some fifteen hundred places of worship had been opened and kept open.

Some of these had not been long built before they were demolished. The Dissenters, whose interests were bound up with the Hanoverian Succession, were unanimously on the side of the King against the Pretender; consequently, when in 1715 the Pretender was proclaimed as James III., the Jacobites raised the cries of "Church in danger!" "High Church and Sacheverell!" and "No Presbyterianism!" as in the days of Queen Anne, and proceeded to pull down or set fire to the meeting-houses of the Dissenters. At Oxford their places of worship were all destroyed, so were chapels at Wrexham and Nuneaton, and also many in Staffordshire and other parts of England. On the suppression of the rebellion, the Dissenters waited upon the King, and, referring to the treatment they had received, went on to say that whenever there had been a design to introduce Popery and arbitrary power into England, the Protestant Dissenters had generally been the first to be attacked. The King, in reply, expressed his concern at the "unchristian and barbarous treatment" which they had received, and promised compensation.

Jacobite Outrages.

The political history of Nonconformity in the eighteenth century is largely concerned with the endeavour to set aside certain disabilities which still clung to its adherents, even after the Act of Toleration had given them legal status. The Corporation Act of 1661 provided that no person could be elected as mayor, alderman, recorder, bailiff, town-clerk, or common-councilman of any city, borough, or corporation, who had

Nonconformist Disabilities.

not, within one year next before such election, taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. The Test Act of 1673, it is quite certain, was aimed, not at the Nonconformists, but only at the Popish recusants, the nation thinking itself to be in danger of Popery from the King, and from the Duke of York as heir presumptive to the throne. At the same time, it did affect them by widening the scope of the Corporation Act. It provided that every person who should be admitted into any office, or receive any pay by reason of any patent or grant of His Majesty, or hold any command or place of trust under or by his authority in England and Wales, Berwick, the royal navy, or the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, must within six months take the oaths and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation, and must also within six months receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England, in some public church on some Lord's day, immediately after divine service, and produce a certificate from the minister and churchwardens to show that he had done so. Any person convicted of executing any such office without complying with the conditions laid down, was thenceforth disabled from suing in a court of law, acting as guardian or executor, taking any legacy or deed of gift, or bearing any public office, and was further liable to a penalty of £500.

These Acts, remaining unaffected by the Act of Toleration, were felt by the Nonconformists to be a serious grievance. They declared their readiness to take the oaths of allegiance, abjuration, and supremacy required, but objected to receiving the sacrament after the manner of the Church of England—not merely because they did not belong to that Church, but still more because they felt it a sort of sacrilege to take a solemn religious act of any Church, appointed only for religious purposes, and use it as a mere qualification for civil office. In their view, it would tend to degrade religion and bring it into contempt—as Cowper, later in the century, expressed it:

> "To make the symbols of atoning grace
> An office-key, a pick-lock to a place."

They pointed out that so far as the Corporation Act was concerned, its effect had been to disqualify many men of substance and capacity, and, in some cases, to throw the

management of public affairs into the hands of incompetent people, to the prejudice of corporations, the discouragement of industry, and the decay of trade. And as for the Test Act, which was intended to guard against the danger of Popery from the prince on the throne and his presumptive heir, it was now no longer needed, inasmuch as the reigning King was a Protestant, and the succession was fixed in a House zealously attached to the Protestant religion.

A further cause of grievance was found in the Occasional Conformity Act, of 1711, which provided that any person holding any civil or military office who should be found in a conventicle, or in any religious meeting of more than ten persons, other than one conducted according to the rites of the Established Church, should forfeit the sum of £40, and be disabled for the future from holding any public office.

The Agitation against Tests.

In 1717 an agitation was commenced for the repeal of these Acts, and the following year Earl Stanhope introduced a Bill into the House of Lords for the purpose. He asserted the rights of Dissenters to the full privileges of citizenship, and contended that the measure proposed would have the effect of strengthening the Church of England rather than weakening it. He was supported by Bishop Hoadly in an eloquent speech on behalf of the principles of Christian liberty, maintaining that all religious tests were an abridgment of the natural rights of man, an injury to the State, and a scandal to religion. Hoadly was followed on the same side by the Bishops of Gloucester and Lincoln, but the most telling speech of all was that by Bishop Kennet, of Peterborough, who broadly declared that the arbitrary measures of persecution adopted in the past had brought contempt on the clergy and disaster to the State. He ridiculed the cry of "Church in danger!" which, he said, had been raised for sinister purposes, and merely amounted to "a mighty noise in the mouths of silly women and children." On a division, the second reading was carried by 86 votes to 68; but on going into committee the clauses relating to the Test and Corporation Acts were withdrawn from the Bill, and it passed without them. The reason given for withdrawal was that Lord Sunderland assured the King that to attempt to repeal the Test Act

would only be to ruin the Bill; the Dissenters were, therefore, informed through Lord Barrington that it was the wish of the King that, while the Occasional Conformity Act was repealed, the question of the Test and Corporation Acts should be deferred. In deference to this wish of the King, they yielded the point for the present, on the express assurance that before long these Acts also should be repealed. It was, however, more than a century before they were. The matter was delayed from year to year, on the plea of Sir Robert Walpole that the time was inopportune, or, as the Queen put it, that "All times were not proper to do proper things." Further attempts to secure repeal were made in 1787 and in 1789, when Mr. Beaufoy took charge of bills for the purpose in the House of Commons; and again in 1790, when Fox brought the matter forward, making a memorable speech in vindication of religious liberty, and of the public services of the Dissenters. By this time, however, the French Revolution had produced a scare against liberty, and the bill was lost by an overpowering majority. It was not till the 9th of May, 1828, that a Bill for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts received the royal assent.

Relaxations of Restrictions.

Still several distinct steps forward were meanwhile made in the direction of liberty. In 1732 the body still in existence, and known as the Dissenting Deputies, was created to watch over the interests of religious liberty, and in 1754 it proceeded to take action in a case closely affecting their London brethren. In 1742 Robert Grosvenor, who was a Dissenter, was elected to the office of Sheriff, and on his refusal to qualify by taking the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, was cited by the Corporation before the Court of Queen's Bench, which decided against his claim to exemption. To meet such cases in future, the Corporation then passed a bye-law imposing a fine of £400 upon every person who declined to stand for the office after being nominated, and a fine of £600 upon every person who, being elected, refused to serve. This bye-law was deliberately intended as a means of oppression. When a Sheriff was to be elected, Dissenters, one after another, were nominated, and, as they all refused to serve, the fines were levied, amounting in the course of six years to more

The Sheriffs of London.

than £15,000, which went towards the erection of the new Mansion House.

In 1754 it was resolved to make a stand against this oppressive procedure. In that year three Dissenters, one after another, were elected to the office of Sheriff, and, advised by the Deputies, refused to serve and resisted the payment of the fine. They were at once cited to the Sheriff's Court, where judgment was given against them. They then appealed to the Court of Hustings, of which the Recorder of the City was sole judge, and he also gave against them. They then sued for a special commission of five judges, who, in 1762, reversed the decisions of the courts below. The Corporation then brought a writ of error before the House of Lords, when the case was argued at great length in 1767, and judgment given for the Dissenters. It was then that Lord Mansfield gave his memorable utterance, showing that on every ground on which they could rest their plea the Corporation had failed. In eloquent words he denounced the spirit by which they had been animated, declaring that persecution was unreasonable, inconsistent with the rights of human nature, and contrary to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion. Referring to the bye-law made by the Corporation, he said its professed design was to get fit and able persons to serve the office; but were he to deliver his own suspicion, it would be that they did not so much wish for service as for fines. Dissenters had been appointed to this office—one who was blind, another who was bedridden—not, he supposed, on account of their being fit and able to serve the office. In the case before their lordships the defendants were by law incapable, and it was his firm persuasion that they were chosen because they were incapable. They were chosen that they might fall under the penalty of a bye-law made to serve a particular purpose. He concluded by moving their lordships that the judgment be affirmed, which it was.

This gain in the direction of freedom made in 1767 was followed by another in 1779, when Protestant Dissenting Ministers and Schoolmasters were no longer required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, but were simply required to make a declaration that they were Christians and Protestants, and accepted the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing the revealed will of God. In 1812, the Quakers'

Oaths, the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts, which till then had remained on the Statute Book, were repealed, and the Free Churches were placed, in respect to legal protection from disturbance during times of public worship, on an equality with the Established Church. The Unitarians had been excepted from the privileges granted by the Act of Toleration, and till the eighteenth century remained under the ban of the law, conducting their worship and publishing their opinions by sufferance. In 1813, however, a Bill was brought into Parliament for the repeal of the statutes of William III. and George III. which made it blasphemy for any person to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and which exempted all such persons from the benefit of the Toleration Act. By the passing of this Bill the Unitarians came into possession of all the rights enjoyed by other Dissenters.

The Unitarians.

The history of Nonconformity in the eighteenth century has been divided into two portions as that of the Old Dissent and that of the Modern Dissent, the Old declining towards the middle of the century and the Modern taking its rise out of the Revival under Wesley and Whitfield. The causes of the decline of the Old Dissent were varied in their action. The men who came out of the Church in 1662, and who gave to Nonconformity its distinctive character and first spiritual impulse, had all passed away, their very names being only a dim and indistinct tradition to the younger generation. With the loosing of the personal ties which had bound many aristocratic families to men like Owen, Baxter, and Howe came the drifting away of these families to the Established Church. This was the case not merely in London, but with the provinces. Where there were able and eloquent preachers who were exemplary in their lives, and where the clergy were neither able nor exemplary, the Nonconformists grew by accessions from the professional and trading classes. But when the movement of energy which followed upon the Act of Toleration had spent itself, there came a period of reaction and decline. Dr. Priestley, who knew Lancashire well, reckoned that in the reigns of the first two Georges the Dissenters had diminished in that county by one-third of their original number. The landed gentry, especially of the

The Decline of Dissent.

higher class, many of whom had been Presbyterian from the time of the Commonwealth, had generally forsaken them, and of the old Nonconformist families there was scarcely a representative left in their sanctuaries. The Occasional Conformity Act (1711-18) also told in the same direction. Men like Sir Thomas Abney and Sir John Fryer, aldermen of the City of London, with the mayors of several country corporations, and justices of the peace, were served by private chaplains and ceased to attend the public worship of their own body, simply going to the Communion at their parish churches often enough to save their places.

But while these and similar social forces were at work, the most potent cause of reaction in Nonconformity was the decline of spiritual life. About 1729 complaints began to be heard that the Nonconformist churches were declining in numbers and spiritual efficiency. In a publication entitled "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest," the author questioned the truth of these complaints, maintaining that, while some communities had sunk into feebleness, several in London had risen to great prosperity. He himself made certain complaints and suggested certain changes by way of improvement. This pamphlet called forth another, from the pen of Philip Doddridge, a man of foremost rank and influence in Nonconformity. Under the title of "Free Thoughts on the Best Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest," he pointed out that the question as to whether Dissent was growing or declining was not one of mere religious partisanship, but of truth, honour, and liberty, and in a great measure the cause of serious piety, too. In his opinion, the decline of Nonconformity, so far as there was decline, arose from spiritual declension among the professors, and the remedy lay in the revival of practical religion. The great aristocratic families, he contended, were not the strength of Nonconformist churches, but the common people, and that they were to be reached by a strain of preaching not drily orthodox, but earnestly evangelical.

Here Doddridge laid his hand on the cause of decay; for a wave of lifeless Arian teaching had passed over the pulpits both of the Established Church and of the Nonconformist community. In the case of the latter the change came on gradually and stealthily.

Arianism.

It was first marked by silence as to the great Evangelical truths urged in an earlier time—a silence which was supposed to arise from dislike to the old modes of stating the truth rather than to the truth itself. Definite teaching was set down as dogmatism, and denounced as offensive and unprofitable. More stress came to be laid on the natural and moral grounds on which Christianity rests, and less on the supernatural and spiritual. The old phrases continued to be used, but came to be emptied of their former meaning. As it has been said, men talked their fathers' language after they had lost their fathers' faith. The religion of the meeting-house subsided into little more than a tradition and a formality.

It was during this time of slumber and decay that public attention began to be aroused by two young clergymen who had broken away from the ordinary conventional grooves and modes of Church life. John Wesley, the son of the rector of Epworth, in Lincolnshire, while a student at Oxford, had passed through a series of deep convictions on spiritual things, but the decisive era in his religious life he always noted as having taken place at a fellowship meeting held in Aldersgate Street, while someone was reading Luther on the Galatians to the rest. That day his eyes were opened as never before, and he came to see that living faith was concerned with the living person of Christ rather than with intellectual creeds or theological propositions. As he says, he "felt his heart strangely warmed, that he did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation," and had "assurance given him that Christ had taken away his sin and saved him from the law of sin and death." He came to see that the Spirit of God was not merely in the Bible, but in the souls of living men, giving light and life to the men of the eighteenth century as to those of the first.

The Wesleyan Movement.

John Wesley.

If this was fanaticism, it was fanaticism that for more than fifty years bore the strain of one of the most strenuous and perfectly organised lives ever lived. Having preached for some time in such churches as were open to him in London and the provinces, in 1742 he went down to his native place at Epworth, and, being refused liberty to preach in the church, notice was given that he would preach in the

churchyard. Standing on his father's tombstone, he addressed the people who gathered round him, and such was the impression produced that for seven successive evenings after that he preached again, producing marvellous results. That week will ever live in the religious history of the period as the real beginning of a great and memorable career.

George Whitefield.

His co-worker in the great religious revival then beginning was George Whitefield, who also had been trained for the Church, and had also gone through deep spiritual experiences. While destitute of Wesley's marvellous power of organisation, he was without rival as the pulpit orator of the century in which he lived. Men of the most varied orders of mind bore witness to the profound impression he produced. Those who listened to him were not only interested and convinced, but quickened with a new kind of life. As early as 1739 he commenced field-preaching among the colliers of Kingswood, near Bristol, first to two hundred and afterwards to an audience of ten thousand. Two months later he commenced open-air preaching near London—on Kennington Common, in Hackney Fields and Moorfields, at Smithfield and Mayfair—everywhere with the same overwhelming audiences and with the same marvellous spiritual results. From 1739 till his death in 1770 his work continued on the same lines. When churches or chapels were opened to him, he gladly preached in them; when they were denied, or were too small for his audiences, just as readily he took to the churchyard, the market square, or the village green.

The effect of the labours of Wesley and Whitefield was seen in two different ways—first, in the quickening into new life of the churches already existing, and next in the creation of new societies consolidated into the ecclesiastical system known as Wesleyanism. The system grew out of the necessities which the new life had created. The converts made by preaching had to be gathered into societies, and the societies organised with such institutions as would best suit and help those who had just set out in the Christian life. Through Peter Bohler, John Wesley had come in contact with Moravianism, and from that community he adopted the band-meeting and the love-feast; the watch-night and the covenant meeting were his own ideas.

The Wesleyan Organisation.

He had hoped to have secured ministers for his societies, as they rose into being, from among the clergy of the Established Church, but he was disappointed in this. He hesitated at first about employing laymen as preachers, for he was a High Churchman in feeling; but powerful preachers like Thomas Maxfield and John Nelson were raised up among his own followers, and he hesitated no longer. The next step in the way of organisation came when the preachers were called together to confer as to their future action. Thus the first Wesleyan Conference was held in 1744, and consisted of six clergymen and at least four lay-preachers. It may furnish an indication of the manner in which this movement steadily grew if we note that twenty-one years later the Conference of 1765 showed that ninety-two itinerant preachers were then in connection, and that the circuits in two years had increased in England from twenty to twenty-five; in Ireland, from seven to eight; and in Scotland, from two to four. This growth not only continued, but increased in ratio. Wesley died in 1791, and in that year there were 278 ministers in connection with the Wesleyan societies. Up to the last Wesley regarded both himself and these societies as belonging to the Established Church, and he died beseeching his adherents never to leave it. Scarcely had he passed away, however, when there rose up a spirit of revolt against what was felt to be ecclesiastical subserviency to the laws of the Church. Wesley had been careful never to hold meetings at the same times as the services were being held in the Church, and also not to allow the celebration of the Sacraments by Wesleyan ministers. Earnest protests were raised on both these points, and after four years of dispute both claims were conceded; the services came to be held at the same hours as in the churches, the sacraments were administered by their own ministers in their own places of worship, and thus the Wesleyans, about 1795, became a separate body from the National Church.

The Independents.

Many of those awakened under the great Revival joined other communities. The Independents, owing to their more popular form of government, had preserved more spiritual life among them than the Presbyterians. Priestley, speaking on this matter, says:—"Those who are called Independents retain all the

zeal of the old Puritans, and receive daily recruits from the Methodists; and many very numerous societies of Independents have been formed out of that body." Other causes contributed to the growth of Nonconformity at the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. If a clergyman were earnest and evangelical, probably his successor would prove the reverse, and the people awakened under his ministry, at his death, sought the same kind of teaching among the Nonconformists to which they had grown accustomed. On the other hand, careless and dissolute clergymen, of whom there were only too many, drove their parishioners into the ranks of Dissent. A clergyman, writing in 1801 of the "Causes for Separation" from the Church, speaks of "the late and present rapid increase of Dissenters;" and of the clerical position as being "considerably altered within the last twenty years by the increase of Dissenting preachers and Dissenting meetings." That there was such increase of Nonconformity is shown by the statistics of registration of their places of worship. From the parliamentary return of 1853, already referred to (p. 229), it appears that while in the decennial period from 1731-40 the number of meeting-houses registered was only 448, in the period from 1791 to 1800 the number rose to 4,394; from 1801 to 1810, to 5,460; and from 1811 to 1820, to 10,161; making 20,015 in thirty years. Though the great majority of these places registered were dwelling-houses and rooms recognised as temporary buildings, yet they indicate an enormous accession of activity and zeal, and a great increase of numbers in the ranks of Nonconformity, as contrasted with the earlier time.

T. WHITTAKER. Philosophy.

It is indicated elsewhere (p. 236) how important an influence was exercised on the religious life of the age by the rationalistic philosophy of which the Deists were the chief exponents. But in this period philosophy advances a stage beyond the Deists' rationalism. David Hume (1711-76) was born at Edinburgh. The "Treatise," written during a stay in France (1734-37), was published at London in 1739-40. The full title was, "A Treatise of Human Nature: Being an Attempt to introduce the Experimental

David Hume.

Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects." Hume, disappointed with its reception by the public, afterwards worked up its separate parts into new dissertations, more highly polished in form, but reduced in matter by the omission of some investigations that were at once abstruser and more completely sceptical in result. The most important omissions are, the examination into the nature of mathematical truth, and the criticism of the conception of substance, mental as well as material. Hume's later philosophical works corresponding to the parts of the "Treatise" are the "Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding" (1748), the "Dissertation on the Passions," and the "Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals" (1751). The "Essays, Literary, Moral, and Political" first appeared in 1741. In a later edition (1770) of the "Essays" there were incorporated the three treatises just mentioned, and the "Natural History of Religion," first published in 1755. The "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion" were posthumously published (1779), but Hume had kept the manuscript by him for a long time.

The "Treatise" and its Later Form.

Other Philosophical Works.

In its most general aspect, the result of Hume's work was sceptical. By carrying the criticism of Locke and Berkeley to its conclusion, he showed the impossibility, according to the philosophical principles then recognised, of a rational construction by way of demonstration in metaphysics or in natural theology. But Hume's work had also a positive side. In politics, for example, his criticism, by getting rid of all assumptions about an "original contract," prepared the way for inquiry into the historical origins of institutions. Similarly, in relation to the deistic controversy, he showed that to assume a kind of ethical monotheism as the primitive religion of the human race is a mere fancy not based on evidence, and that a polytheism like that of the Greeks and Romans comes much nearer to the character of a primitive or "natural" religion. In his "Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects," Hume appears as one of the founders of associationist psychology. His view of the relation of cause and effect, though a sceptical turn is given to it by contrast with the rationalistic or *à priori* definitions of causality then traditionally accepted, has essentially the

Hume's Work in Philosophy.

character of what is now called pre-eminently the "positive" view; and, in ethics, Hume was the first to give definite formulation to what has since been known as utilitarianism.

The Association Theory.

The "association of ideas" had long been regarded as a principle manifested in the phenomena of memory. By Hobbes, Locke, and Berkeley it had been implicitly made use of to explain more complex mental phenomena. Locke, in a chapter of the "Essay," had introduced the phrase to describe those peculiar associations that get fixed in individual minds through special experience. Hume now proceeded to generalise the principle, putting forward the view that mental "association" is a kind of universal attraction comparable to the gravitation of matter. He reduced the grounds of association to three —viz. Resemblance, Contiguity in Time or Place, Cause and Effect. The contents of mind, according to Hume, are "impressions" and "ideas," the latter reproductions of impressions. The laws of association explain how impressions and ideas become combined in their actual order, since every mental state tends to call up again the mental state which it resembles, or which formerly accompanied or followed or preceded it, or which appeared in the relation to it of cause or effect.

That cause and effect should be made a separate ground of association of ideas is not quite in harmony, as critics have pointed out, with Hume's theory of causation. When he comes to develop this, he arrives at the conclusion that the only source for the idea we suppose ourselves to have of a causal *nexus* is customary experience. Having found certain events always conjoined in a certain order, we expect that they will continue to be conjoined in the same order. This irrational expectation being all that we find in the case, there is no intuitively-felt necessity in the causal relation. Nor is any particular effect logically deducible from its cause prior to experience. In practice, we must argue from causes to effects on the ground of past experience, assuming that future experience will resemble the past. So far as we argue thus, causation must be assumed just as much in mind as in things. In many cases, indeed, we are actually more sure of what a particular person will do under given circumstances than we can be as to the results of the physical properties of matter.

Hume, accordingly, in spite of the sceptical element in his theory of causation, belongs to the succession of psychological determinists.

Hume's Ethics.

In his ethical theory, Hume finds that the ground of our approval of actions is their utility to the agent or to others. There is in man a principle of sympathy by which the good of others is a source of pleasure, and injury done to them a source of pain, even to those who have personally no part in it. The different moral virtues derive their character partly from the relative extent to which desires for personal good and sympathy with others enter into them, partly from the respective shares of spontaneous feeling, and of reasoning about means and ends, in their formation. "Reason" is not a supreme moral principle; it only enables us to calculate the means by which we may attain ends assigned by the feelings, one of which is disinterested benevolence. By these distinctions, Hume contends, the controversy between the schools of "reason" and of "moral sense" may easily be brought to a settlement.

Adam Smith as a Moral Philosopher.

Closely related to Hume's ethical doctrine is that of Adam Smith, set forth in his "Theory of Moral Sentiments" (1759). A very distinctive point of Adam Smith's doctrine is the notion of the "impartial spectator." The impartial spectator, through the natural principle of sympathy, represents in himself the motives of others; and, according as he approves or disapproves of them, regards the resulting conduct as morally good or bad. The demand of morality is so to act that the impartial spectator can sympathise with us. We are enabled to pass ethical judgments on ourselves by asking whether, if we were in the place of the impartial spectator, we should sympathise with the motives we are conscious of and approve of the resulting action. Thus, conscience may be regarded as the impartial spectator in our breast.

Hartley's Association-Psychology.

David Hartley (1704-57) is usually regarded as the father of English associational psychology. This view of him is correct in so far as later Associationism was derived from Hartley rather than from Hume, though Hume had the priority in generalising the principle of association. Hartley's doctrine is set forth in the "Observations on Man: his

Frame, his Duty, and his Expectations" (1749). For the first suggestion of his psychological theory he was indebted, not to Hume, but to a clergyman named Gay, who had incidentally made use of the principle of association in morals to explain how means come to be sought as if they were themselves the ends of action. In Hartley's doctrine the attempt is made to reduce all laws of association to that of contiguity. By this single law, not only reminiscence, but the phenomena of perception, thought, emotion, and volition, are to be explained as results of the combination of mental elements. The psychological doctrine of association of ideas is combined with a theory of the physiological concomitants of mental processes. This is derived from a suggestion of Newton in the "Principia," and consists in the view that there are, corresponding to mental processes, physical "vibrations" in the nervous substance, which leave behind "vibratiuncles" of a similar kind. These are not regarded as identical with the psychical states, but only as their invariable concomitants. Consistently with his psycho-physical doctrine, Hartley is a determinist.

Priestley's Philosophic Writings.

Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), though more original in his contributions to experimental science than to philosophy, is also of some note as a philosophic writer. In 1775 he published an abridged edition of Hartley's "Observations" under the title of "Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind on the Principles of the Association of Ideas." Here he detaches Hartley's psychological doctrine from his physical hypothesis. In "Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit" (1777), and "The Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity" (1777), he defends materialism and determinism. Like Hartley, he sought to reconcile his philosophy with belief in Christianity. Theism he regards as proved by the ordering of the universe; and, while rejecting the idea of a natural immortality of the soul, he believes that man is to be supernaturally raised from the dead.

The Association-Theory in Morals.

The doctrine of association of ideas was applied to morals by Abraham Tucker (1705-74) in "The Light of Nature Pursued" (published under the pseudonym of Edward Search, 1768). Tucker is a follower of Locke in general philosophy, and of

Hartley in psychology. "Every man's own satisfaction" he holds to be the ultimate end for the man himself. Through the will of God, this end is connected with the "general good" to which all the rules of morality have reference. The possibility of disinterested action is explained by the principle of association. Paley (whose system will be dealt with in the next chapter), in his later elaboration of theological utilitarianism, expresses his obligations to Tucker.

Price's Ethics.

Richard Price (1723-91) carries forward the intellectualist tradition in morals. Of the earlier English moralists, he most resembles Cudworth. He was an intimate friend of Priestley; but in a correspondence between them, published in 1778, Price appears as the champion of free-will and of the unity and immateriality of the human soul. Among his friends was Franklin, to whom he addressed some observations on statistical questions published in the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1769. His "Appeal to the People on the Subject of the National Debt" (1771) is supposed to have influenced Pitt in re-establishing the sinking fund created by Walpole in 1716 and abolished in 1733 (p. 475). In his ethical treatise entitled "Review of the Principal Questions in Morals" (1757), he maintains against Hutcheson that ideas of right and wrong are perceived by the reason, or understanding, and not by a "sense." They are simple ideas incapable of analysis, and are perceived intuitively; actions being in themselves right or wrong. As with Clarke, right and wrong actions are defined as actions that agree or disagree with the true relations of things. In his position that reason, or understanding, can become a spring of action, by imposing the idea of right as a law upon the will, Price anticipates the ethical doctrine of Kant.

Science.

What is of greatest scientific interest in this period is the gradual passage of electricity and chemistry beyond the tentative stage. In the older sciences discoveries continued to be made. To the preceding period belongs Bradley's discovery of the aberration of light; but as Bradley became Astronomer Royal exactly in 1742, and as his other great discovery of nutation belongs to our present period, his work may be dealt with here.

Astronomy: Bradley.

James Bradley (1692-1762) has been described by an eminent French man of science * as entitled for his discoveries to the most distinguished place among astronomers after Hipparchus and Kepler. The first of his two great discoveries is assigned to the year 1727. A Danish astronomer, Römer, had already made out the velocity of light by observations on the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites. Bradley was led to his discovery of the aberration of light—which is a consequence of its being transmitted, not instantaneously, but with a finite velocity—by a series of observations undertaken for the purpose of determining the annual parallax of the fixed stars. In the course of these observations he found that the stars had a minute apparent motion different from that which the parallax would produce; and at length, by a happy idea, he hit upon the explanation of the fact. The explanation is that, since light and the spectator on the earth are both in motion, the apparent direction in which the object is seen will deviate slightly from its real direction in accordance with the composition of these motions. Bradley continued the observations by which he had made this discovery: and the result was his other great discovery of the nutation of the earth's axis. This he had thought of at first as a possible cause of the motion due to aberration, but had rejected it as inapplicable. Though it does not explain this particular motion, it turned out to be a fact. A longer series of observations was needed to detect it, because its cycle, instead of being annual, like that of aberration, is a cycle of eighteen years. In this cycle, the earth's pole, besides the motion due to the precession of the equinoxes, moves through a small ellipse, and so changes slightly the apparent place of a star in successive years. Before the end of the half-cycle of nine years, Bradley had worked out his theory connecting nutation with the moon's attraction. By Thomas Simpson and other eminent mathematicians to whom he submitted it, his conjecture was verified, and nutation shown to be a necessary result of the law of gravity. The date to which this discovery is assigned is 1747.

Of the first importance during this period, both as a physical and as a chemical investigator, is Joseph Black

* Delambre, quoted in Whewell's "History of the Inductive Sciences," ii. 202.

(1728-99). In chemistry his name is specially associated with the discovery of "fixed air" (carbonic acid, as it is now familiarly called); in physics with that of "latent heat." Black laid the foundation of quantitative chemistry by his systematic use of the balance. Proceeding by quantitative methods, he was able to prove that the mild earths, such as lime and magnesia, on being burnt become caustic through the expulsion of a peculiar kind of air, which is heavier than atmospheric air and will not support animal life. This was called by Black "fixed air," because it was capable of existing not only in the gaseous state, but also in a state of combination in solid bodies like unburnt magnesia and lime. The discovery of "fixed air" was made in 1754. From 1759 to 1763 Black pursued the inquiries that resulted in his theory of latent heat. He found that when a body by the action of heat passes from the solid to the liquid or from the liquid to the gaseous state, heat is communicated, during the whole time required for the change of state, without raising the temperature. The heat that alters the condition, not the temperature, of a body, he called "latent heat." He also proved that substances of different kinds require unequal increments of heat to raise the same mass through the same interval of temperature. This difference is indicated by the term "specific heat." Black was not only a great discoverer, but also a lucid expositor. In 1766 he was elected to the chair of Chemistry at Edinburgh University, and made the subject fashionable by his lectures.

Physics and Chemistry: Black.

Carbonic Acid Gas.

Latent Heat.

Many important discoveries in pneumatic chemistry were made by Priestley, the most important of all being the discovery of oxygen, or, as Priestley called it, "dephlogisticated air," in 1774. Priestley found that the red oxide of mercury (red precipitate) when heated evolved a gas which was a much better supporter of combustion than common air. He called it "dephlogisticated air" because he supposed that its action might be explained by its having been completely deprived of phlogiston. Atmospheric air, he argued, since it is only in part deprived of phlogiston, supports combustion to a limited extent, the process being that the principle of combustion is drawn from the burning

Priestley's Work in Science.

Discovery of Oxygen.

body by the air till it is completely phlogisticated. "Phlogisticated air" does not support combustion at all. Priestley had proved that about one-fifth of common air is not phlogisticated; and this constituent of the atmosphere he was able to identify with the air evolved by the red oxide of mercury. Priestley's discovery, taken up by Lavoisier, led to the refutation of the theory of phlogiston, and to a complete reconstruction of chemical science; though Priestley himself continued to hold the theory of phlogiston to the last, and sought to explain in accordance with it all the new facts discovered by himself and others.

Effect on Chemical Theory.

It is interesting to note how the science of this time is characterised by the assumption of various fictitious substances such as phlogiston, each serviceable for the explanation of one group of facts. In the theory of heat, for example, the changes of bodies as regards temperature or state were explained by the entrance or departure of a substance named "caloric." For the explanation of electrical phenomena other distinct fluids were assumed, and were endowed with such properties as seemed required. Like phlogiston, these other conceptions were useful provisionally, and some of them are still used for purposes of mathematical calculation or for convenience of exposition; but they are no longer supposed to represent what takes place in things. They have been expelled partly by the growing co-ordination of the different branches of physics and partly by the further development of mechanical conceptions.

Phlogiston, and Other Hypothetical Substances.

The most conspicuous among the electrical discoverers of the period is Benjamin Franklin, who in 1752 sent over to England from Philadelphia an account of the famous experiment in which, by means of a kite, he drew down electricity from the clouds. By this experiment, which was soon repeated and confirmed in England and France, he established the identity, previously conjectured by himself and others, of thunder and lightning with the phenomena of the electrical discharge. Franklin was an electrical theorist, as well as a discoverer of new facts, being one of those who worked out the conception of electrical action as due to a single fluid. Electrical attractions

Electricity: Franklin.

and repulsions, according to this conception, depend on changes in the distribution of the fluid. Where it is accumulated in greater quantity, a body becomes positively electrified; the parts of bodies from which it is withdrawn are said to be electrified negatively.

Watson.

This theory of electricity as positive and negative had been suggested by Sir William Watson (1715-1807), who also made important experimental discoveries. Besides improving the form of the Leyden jar, invented about 1745, he was the first to observe the flash of light which attends its discharge. In a series of experiments instituted by the Royal Society in order to determine the velocity of electricity, he was the chief operator.

Canton.

Another eminent discoverer in this field was John Canton (1718-72). Canton was the first in England to verify Franklin's experimental proof of the identity of lightning with electricity. The next year (1753) his paper on "Electrical Experiments, with an Attempt to Account for their several Phenomena," was read before the Royal Society. In this paper he made mention of his discovery that some clouds are positively, and others negatively, electrified. Franklin had made a similar discovery in America, and this circumstance led to a lasting friendship between Canton and Franklin. Canton's most important discovery was probably that of "electrical induction"; or, the attractions and repulsions which other bodies are caused to exert by the neighbourhood of electrified bodies. He succeeded in giving a theoretical explanation of these phenomena according to the doctrine, then accepted, of "electrical atmospheres."

Other Investigations.

A more elaborate theory of electrical induction was worked out by Æpinus and by Cavendish. This will be referred to in the next chapter. Here a few other notable experiments may be mentioned. By Priestley, Canton, and others the phenomenon of "pyro-electricity" was investigated. This consists in the acquisition of electrical polarity by certain substances, of which tourmaline is one, under the action of heat. Investigations were also made of the electricity of fishes. The shock of the torpedo was proved to be electric; and Hunter studied the anatomy of its electrical organs. In the *Philosophical*

Transactions of 1776 Cavendish gave an account of the construction of an artificial torpedo, by which the actions of the living animal were imitated. Robert Symmer, about 1759, made interesting experiments on the attractions and repulsions of silk and worsted stockings of the same and of different colours. Symmer maintained, in an improved form, the theory of two distinct electric fluids, already put forward by Dufay. This theory, like the theory of a single fluid, gradually came to receive adequate mathematical formulation. Electricians now had clearly in view the discovery of a law of electrical force corresponding to the law of gravity.

G. SAINTSBURY. Literature.

THE historian, and especially the bird's-eye historian, of English literature may have periods more intoxicating to his sense of the highest literary beauty, fuller of work of various kinds, more distinguished by names of the most world-wide fame, and otherwise more remarkable, than those four decades in the middle of the eighteenth century which form our present subject. But he can hardly have one of a rounder, completer, and more characteristic interest. It is dominated throughout by the presence, and through a large part of it by the undisputed pre-eminence, of the singular and capital figure of Johnson. It sees the rise, culmination, and, for the time, collapse of one of the greatest achievements in prose fiction. It sees in the same way (even if we generously leave Gibbon, with Burke and Reynolds, all of whom partly belong to it, to the next chapter) the solid establishment, for the first time, of a great English School in history. Believing itself to be thoroughly "classical" and "correct," it lays the foundations of the Romantic revival which at its close was to be actually introduced by Burns and Blake, by Crabbe and Cowper; and it witnesses not merely the Romantic excursions of Percy in the right way, but those of Walpole, Macpherson, and Chatterton in ways more or less wrong. It develops, between Classicism and Romanticism, a very curious school of poetry of its own, of which Gray and Collins are the pillars. And, lastly, it has acquired, if not exactly fame, at least notoriety, as the special time—the prime not golden but very much the reverse—of "Grub

Features of the Period.

Street." To these years, from the time when Boyse (the original "Scroggen") was found writing with his arms thrust through holes in the blanket, to that when Chatterton perished in his pride, and, it may be feared, also in his folly, belong the scenes, real or supposed, which Macaulay has dashed off in one of his most brilliant and famous passages, and which, before and after him, others have depicted in their own way and with their own success or non-success.

A sketch of literature written in connection with Social History cannot afford to pass Grub Street: and we may as well deal with it *in limine*. Nor shall I beat much about the bush before announcing that though not much given to paradoxical new views, or to the rather childish practice of differing with my betters for the sake of difference, I regard Grub Street with a good deal of suspicion. A few of its houses may have been built on solid ground; but I think it went off into cloudland. In other words, I regard the Macaulayan picture of the almost necessary and regular woes and hardships of mid-century men of letters with a great deal of scepticism. The stock instances, the awful examples, are open to very considerable demur. Savage, Boyse, and Chatterton are the three usually quoted victims. Now Chatterton's case was so altogether exceptional that it might have happened at almost any time; Savage was, at the best, a very minor poet who had the luck to have a man of genius for comrade and panegyrist, at the worst a Bohemian Mohock who must have come to grief in almost any circumstances; Boyse was such a scoundrel that his own legend accuses him of sharing the profits of his wife's dishonour, and such a *fainéant* that he lost a good appointment because it rained on the morning when he was to have presented his letters of recommendation. You can draw no inference from instances such as these—of persons who poison themselves as mere children after a huge piece of forgery, or of persons who would have starved, in the very paradise of the six-shilling novel, from sheer vicious folly.

Grub Street.

But, it is said, Fielding, Collins, Johnson, Goldsmith were all persons of undoubted genius; though some of them had foibles, they had nothing worse than foibles, and all of them were either arrested, or in danger of arrest, for debt. Again let us examine a little. Collins, whose period of probation

was but a short one, had presented himself to the public with the tiniest possible pamphlet of no doubt remarkable verses. I know there is a vague idea that the poet ought instantly to be fed with turtle from gold spoons by a grateful public, and perhaps he ought; but it is quite certain that if John Milton in the seventeenth century, or Alfred Tennyson in the nineteenth, had attempted to live and pay bills on the profits of "L'Allegro," and "The Palace of Art," neither would have been treated by their times better than Collins was. Fielding's unthrift may have been exaggerated; but he certainly had a talent for getting through money, and when he took to his proper vocation he received, as a totally unknown novelist, the not absolute pittance of £150, and then the very considerable sum of £600 for his second venture. Johnson threw himself upon London without money, without introductions, without even a degree, and though with much vague learning, yet with no special "line" or aptitude; while it must also be remembered that Johnson was admittedly and notoriously incapable of steady work, a born procrastinator, and a writer in moods, and not very frequent moods. As for Goldsmith, even some of the believers in Grub Street have confessed that a poet who is allowed to get two thousand pounds in debt, and who appears to have spent plenty of actually earned money besides, cannot blame others, whatever he may do to himself, on the score of "want of pence."

It is, of course, true enough that there is a striking, and, at first sight, a rather inexplicable contrast between the time when Harley and Montague vied with each other in giving "places with *pin*sions" to celebrated men of letters, and that when Walpole cared for none of these things and none of these persons. It is also true that both periods contrast strongly with the later one when very considerable sums came in for copy-money, and that when, later still, authors could fill in the times between the appearance of their big books with review or magazine articles at fifty or a hundred pounds apiece. But here, also, it is necessary to be careful. Smollett, towards the very middle of our period, made two thousand pounds by his "History of England," a piece of extraordinarily good hack-work, no doubt, but a piece of hack-work if ever there was one. Dr. John Campbell, the subject of Johnson's curious encomium as to his churchmanship, is

known to have made, by working for the booksellers, a more than comfortable income for many years; so apparently did Shebbeare; so did others; while the career of William Whitehead, the Poet-Laureate, is an example of what extremely moderate talent, combined with respectable life, fair industry, and a little patronage, could effect.

The facts seem to be that the brilliant success of Addison, Swift, and Pope tempted an increasingly large number of young persons—sometimes from the Universities, sometimes not—to "turn literary men;" that the separation between the literary and the ecclesiastical career was beginning; that a good many of the denizens of Grub Street went on the very common delusion that you can take to a business and make a living by it on other than businesslike principles; and that for a time newspapers, circulating libraries, and the other machinery for keeping authors were not in full working order. But that a man of good abilities, decent prudence, regular industry, and that fair introduction to his special profession which is wanted in all professions, had, if he did not go mad like Collins and Smart, a much worse chance in the middle of the eighteenth century than at any other time, is a thing which I at least must for the present regard as Not Quite Proven.

Samuel Johnson.

Next to the supposed existence of Grub Street, the undoubted existence of its most famous denizen, the Great Lexicographer, must claim special notice. The career of Johnson, the material facts of which are, thanks to Boswell, and to the commentators on Boswell, too well known to need any recapitulation here, began indeed a little before our anterior limit; for he had brought out his first poem and had been complimented by Pope (who also tried to assist him) as early as 1738. But the years immediately succeeding were occupied by drudgery for Cave; and it was not till 1744 that Johnson's first independent prose work—the extremely partial but very agreeable "Life of Savage"—appeared. He died forty years later—the forty years of our present period. The earlier part of this long stretch is, by common consent, as little known as the later, when James Boswell had been sent from Heaven and Scotland to be his chronicler, is well known; and it is still a somewhat unexplained marvel how Johnson—penniless, something of a

hermit, with no great friends, and with literary performances which, though never contemptible, were never exactly great —should have climbed or slipped into the position which he always more or less held for at least three of these four decades.

His Literary Life.

The first of the four saw the announcement and the completion, under difficulties (though the appearance was a little postponed), of the "Dictionary" with, in 1749, the memorable, if not quite gigantic, item of the "Vanity of Human Wishes" (an enormous advance on "London"); the qualified success of the worthless tragedy of *Irene*, in the same year; the interesting periodical attempts in Addisonian vein of *The Rambler*, which he wrote almost entirely between 1750 and 1752, and *The Adventurer*, in which he supplied Hawkesworth with some score and a half of numbers.

The second decade almost opened with the "Dictionary," which appeared in the spring of 1755, and with that famous snubbing letter to Chesterfield, which is certainly a very fine piece of English prose, but which has, perhaps, had quite sufficient admiration from critics and historians. Chesterfield's civility may have been rather empty and belated, but it hardly needed such a ninety-gun-ship broadside as this to blow a cock-boat out of the water; there is no evidence that the much-abused author of the "Letters" had ever disappointed any reasonable hopes of Johnson's; and it may possibly seem to some incorrigible Advocates of the Devil that so solemn a remonstrance with a patron argues a rather undue readiness to take it for granted that a patron is bound to play Providence.

But this may pass. Between 1758 and 1760 appeared *The Idler*, a series of papers not independently published, which is, as a whole, superior to *The Rambler*. "Rasselas" appeared during the interval, in 1759; and then, with the exception of the much later and much greater "Lives of the Poets," Johnson's purely literary work was done. His troubles were done likewise. He had always been a Tory, and though he had been also something of a Jacobite, the sort of eirenicon accepted between kingsmen of all kinds at the time made it not in the least improper for him to take a pension from George III. It would have been better if he had

never undertaken his "Shakespeare," which he delayed so long that there were accusations (rather juster than those about the pension) of bad faith with the subscribers, and which he did but ill at last. But, in 1763, he was introduced to his fated *vates*, Boswell, and next year "The Club" came into being.

For nearly thirty years Johnson had been in quest of a vocation and a livelihood; for more than twenty others he had found the latter, but had been rather insufficiently provided with the former. Yet another twenty remained to him, during which, except for perpetual ill health and loneliness (for his wife, the famous Tetty, was now some time dead), he lived his life very nearly as much according to his own special way and choice as any man of letters of whom history gives record. His last house, that in Bolt Court, though not fashionable or splendid, appears to have been comfortable and decently equipped; the queer group of dependents he got together in it were his own choice, and not forced on him by a reluctantly accepted relationship, or, worse still, an ill-assorted marriage; he had society of every sort that he cared for, and ruled all societies in which he appeared. Between 1770 and 1775 he wrote four political pamphlets, the best known of which by title—none of them can be said to be well known in contents—was "Taxation no Tyranny," exposing with unanswerable logic and historical accuracy, but with a somewhat insufficient attention to time and circumstance, the groundlessness of the American rebellion. In 1773 Boswell took him to Scotland—a famous journey, whereof the travellers have left two famous accounts. He became an LL.D. in 1775, and two years later he began the "Lives of the Poets." His very last years were saddened by ever-increasing ill-health, and by fits of the terrible depression which pursued him through life, as well as by what he thought the unkindness of Mrs. Thrale, whose house at Streatham, during her husband's life, had been his favourite resort, and on whom, after that husband's death and in her quest for another, Johnson seems to have become a burden. But he had many other faithful allies, from Edmund Burke to Fanny Burney; and when he died, on December 13th, 1784, certainly not the unluckiest, though as certainly not the least great of Englishmen passed away. The unkindness of the

Fates to him has, perhaps, sometimes been exaggerated; the kindness of the Muses not so.

Work and Character.

Yet all competent critics—and he has occupied the most competent—have found it not merely necessary to admit that the man was greater than his works, but not specially easy to indicate the special character of his human greatness. After much undue praise and some exaggerated depreciation of the work itself, the best judges are agreed to consider it, with the possible exception of the "Lives of the Poets," eminently second-rate. The "Lives of the Poets," strangely far from the centre as some of the judgments go, are not second-rate; but they did not obtain for Johnson his fame in his own day, and it may be suspected that they profited even more by that fame than they helped to make it. By the time when he wrote them, Johnson, never disposed to extreme humility except as a matter of religious conviction, could speak with authority as hardly Dryden, hardly Pope, hardly his namesake a hundred and fifty years earlier, could have spoken: and authority is a great thing in giving judgment. A junior barrister may be quite as clever and almost as good a lawyer as a Lord Chief Justice, but he will never give judgment with such weight. But, it must be added (and it is specially important here), to Johnson's credit, that he had the real judicial qualities and, at the same time, he was eminently of his time. What he knew not was sometimes very specially worth knowing; but his time did not think so. What he knew was what his time thought best worth knowing. And, further, for all his whim, for all his prejudice, for all his common (and exceedingly bad) habit of "talking for victory," he had this eminently judicial mind at a time when no quality of human nature was better cultivated than judgment. In mere knowledge he might sometimes go wrong; in mere taste, frequently; in crotchet, perpetually. But he was perfectly honest; there was not an atom or a shred of cant in him; his moral nature in his best moments was of the noblest, the kindest, the sanest ever known or even conceivable. We are sometimes told that his greatness is the creation of Boswell. His own age, the age of Burke and Gibbon, was neither foolish nor credulous; it had not read Boswell, and it made no mistake about Johnson. He is not the greatest or the most

universal of our men of letters, but he is by far the most English; and very little shame need we take to ourselves so long as we can point to him as our literary embodiment, if not exactly our literary exemplar or masterpiece.

But the personality of Johnson is not more dominant among the personalities of this time than the kind or species of the novel is dominant among the kinds of its production. Industrious persons have been able to show that long before the middle of the century the production of novels in England was very large. But unless anyone be so curiously minded as to call "Gulliver" a novel, nobody but Defoe had devoted genius to prose fiction, and Defoe's performances came from nothing and led to nothing. The four great novelists of the mid-eighteenth century were themselves immediately preceded by no one, and followed by very few in their own kind; but they present a distinct, a permanent, and a necessary development in the general history of prose fiction. Before them there existed the romance; there existed, as produced by Madame de La Fayette and her followers in France, the novelette; but there did not exist—though Marivaux, if he had been less indolent, might have furnished it—the novel.

The Novelists.

They were of very different ages, but the earliest performances of the three of them who come closest together (Sterne is a kind of outsider) coincided very nearly in time, and, indeed, were pretty certainly the result, not exactly of imitation, but of example, exciting original genius and talent. "Pamela" appeared in 1740; "Joseph Andrews," its parody, though vastly more than its parody, in 1742; "Roderick Random" in 1748. But Richardson had been born as early as 1688, though he did not die till 1763; Fielding's birth-year was 1707 (he died in 1754); and Smollett was fourteen years younger than Fielding (whom he outlived by seventeen) and more than thirty years younger than Richardson. Sterne (1713-68) came between Fielding and Smollett, but the long period of contented idleness which he spent on his Yorkshire livings threw him behind all of them in publication; and it was not till 1760 that "Tristram Shandy" came as a New Year's gift to a half-puzzled and half-delighted world. Each of these men had such strong and distinct natural gifts that it is almost unbelievable that any one of

them should have died without giving something to the public; yet each of them in turn was apparently indebted to his forerunners for at least suggestion, and it is not fanciful to suppose that there was something abroad, some spirit of earth or air, which affected them all. However this may be, in the course of the thirty years from "Pamela" to "Humphry Clinker" they gave to the department of English literature which had hitherto been one of the poorest in numbers or quantity of production, nearly, if not quite, the poorest in public estimation, and—except for the work of Bunyan, Defoe, and Swift—absolutely the poorest in literary merit, a rank which enabled it positively to look down upon all its own contemporaries, and secured it a respectable position for all time.

There was much other novel-writing in their day—some of it by no means contemptible, some of it deserving of the fullest and most sovereign contempt. But the better work—the charming fantasy of "Peter Wilkins," the quaint and genial absurdity of "John Buncle," the estimable performances of Sarah Fielding, Henry's sister, and of Charlotte Lennox—are not characteristic but exceptional, and not extraordinarily noteworthy as exceptions; while as for the novel-garbage of the time—dull or dirty, trivial or pompous—novel-garbage is much the same at all times, and at no time calls for anything but a squeegee and a scavenger. Even in regard to the great works just mentioned this is not the place for individual criticism. We can say, in general, that Richardson, besides for the first time subordinating mere adventure (though he still had to give something of that) to the full delineation of character and the elaborate representation of common life, succeeded for the first time also in English prose fiction in stealing from the stage the peculiar appeal of dramatic interest, and exercising upon his readers something like the traditional purgation by pity and terror which is supposed to belong to tragedy, with touches even of the satiric criticism of life and manners which comedy claims as her own. We can add that Fielding, taking (it can hardly be said borrowing) the same conception of the novel, further informed and inspirited it with a gigantic and wonderful humour; shook out of it the morbidness on one side

Their Work: Richardson.

Fielding.

and the meticulous minuteness on the other, which are the great drawbacks of Richardson's method; impressed upon it a stamp of completeness, of thorough humanity, which no novelist has ever improved upon, while few have equalled it; and, lastly, gave to fiction a constructive architecture, a thoroughly engineered scheme, unsurpassed in regularity and art by any other kind. We can point out that Smollett, retrograding a little in this matter of construction, in the strict general humanity of his types, and in the height and range of his humorous criticism of life, introduced a vast number of diverting oddities and humours, and blended once more the older and more varied, if more superficial, interest of incident and adventure with the newer one of character and manners. Lastly, we may show Sterne, like the farce of the great tetralogy, attempting and achieving a mainly fantastic kind, in which the chief distinguishing attribute of all the four—their truth in this way and that, on this or that scheme, to life—is not less apparent than in the others, for all the fantasticalities. With this great science or art of presenting life Richardson deals as a cabalist or scholastic, Fielding as a consummate artist-scholar, Smollett as a lusty writer of comedy that does not disdain to drop into farce, Sterne as a half-Rabelaisian, half-sentimental fantast. But all are in their several ways true to it; and all expound it in a way which had been hitherto thought the province of the poet alone.

Smollett.

Sterne.

From our special point of view, moreover, there is an interest in these men and their work which is positively new. Hitherto we have had to construct the life and the men of the times by a more or less laborious process. The historian has not, up to this time, condescended to give us more than scraps of information; the satirist, valuable in his way, is not so much suspected as convicted of exaggeration; the dramatist not so much believed as known to be guilty of it likewise. That there is some exaggeration in Richardson and Fielding, much in Sterne and Smollett, is, of course, not so much probable as certain. You might have had to go a long way (*cir.* 1750) before finding an exact Squire Western or an exact Sir Stentor Stile; perhaps Parson Trulliber was a little furbished

Their Works and Real Life.

and ornamented; certainly it cannot have been the absolute rule that no young lady of features or fortune rather above the common could venture from home without a squadron of horse and a gang of Bow Street runners to protect her from violent or fraudulent abduction. But the kind of exaggeration is different: the sense of fidelity, the "eye on the object" has come to the novelist. And accordingly the ineffable, the inexplicable sense of confidence comes to his readers. Even in Richardson the most over-studied, in Smollett the most deliberately humorsome, in Sterne the most confessedly fantastic, we feel that the general scheme and *décor*, the "habit as it lived" of the time is true and real; while as for Fielding he is more than an Enchanter Faustus for us. There may have been scenes and sides of life in the mid-eighteenth century that he did not depict—nay, there certainly were such. But whatsoever and whomsoever he has depicted, we know that that thing and that person, allowing the mere touches necessary for art, did so exist that we need be under no doubt about them, that the evidence is better than the preamble of any Act of Parliament.

Poetry.

This is not the criticism which can be passed on the poetical as distinguished from the prose "making" of the period. Attempts have recently been made, by various persons and from various points of view, to mitigate the anathemas which were passed on eighteenth-century poetry in the first burst of the Romantic movement, and during the greater part of the earlier half of this century. These attempts have often been characterised by ingenuity, and have sometimes been not devoid of force. But, taking the most catholic view possible, making every allowance that can be made, what is to be said of a period which for forty years, between the death of Pope and the rise of the quartette above mentioned, contributes nothing that by the utmost stretch of charity can be deemed real poetry of anything like the first class, except the best work of Gray and Collins, the recently-revived masterpiece (itself owing as much to madness as to great wits) of Kit Smart, a little of Shenstone, some flashes of Akenside and Mason, and a few more of other persons? Put it all together, and it would make but a small volume; take its utterances at their very best, and I at least cannot admit that it contains

poetry equal to that which can be found in the work of such imperfect real poets as Blake or Donne.

Yet it is very interesting, and looked at impartially it is much more interesting, as it seems to me, not merely than its decriers would admit, but than its well-meaning but excessive eulogists would infer. With most of its names it is, indeed, simply impossible to deal at all here. Even regular histories of literature have slurred (whether more or less than they should it would not become me to suggest) the work of Mr. Moore (not Thomas) and Mr. Cawthorn, of Mr. Cunningham (not Allan) and Mr. Jago. We cannot, and I would not if we could, devote space to that astonishing Mr. Wilkie, of the "Epigoniad," who, at an early age, put to shame by anticipation the best jokes of the Anti-Jacobin by inditing the couplet:

> "What penetrating mind can rightly form
> A faint idea of a raging storm?"

and who, later, rhymed "bough" and "drew." Even the greater epic-maker, Glover, with his impossible "Leonidas" and "Athenaid," and his just-saved ballad of "Admiral Hosier's Ghost" cannot stay us, and both the Whiteheads ("clean Whitehead and clever Whitehead," as was said of two namesakes in our own day), Fawkes and Lovibond, Mallet and Boyse, Mr. Jenyns and Mr. Cambridge, with many others, must pass untold. Only let me say that if anyone wishes to form a really just idea, disturbed by no mere absurdities, of the poetical character of the period, he should study John Langhorne, who was born in 1735 and died in 1779; and William Julius Mickle, who was born in 1734 and died in 1788. The former, whom few people think of now except as having been the unconscious intermediary between Burns and Scott on the one occasion when they met, was an earlier Crabbe, the latter an earlier Monk Lewis (entirely respectable), and an earlier Southey. Neither in any case, perhaps, would have been a great poet; in the work of both it is impossible not to see—much better than in the unduly famed Beattie and others—the limitations of their time.

Still, of course, what these limitations were must, for ordinary persons with no leisure for studying out of the way examples, be much better seen in the greater names; perhaps it is best seen so by all if they

"Ossian."

will take the trouble. And these greater names, putting Johnson out of the question as only a waif and stray in poetic regions, are beyond all question Shenstone, Collins, Gray, Goldsmith, and Chatterton. The imposture (for that in the main it was imposture is certain) of Macpherson is more interesting as a matter of tendency than of essence. The world wanted romance; it wanted "the Celtic vague"; it wanted anything but what it had had: Macpherson met it with a sort of clumsy genius. All the others named catered for the same want, not with the intelligent scoundrelism of the adulterator, but with the honest attempt of the still unqualified artist.

Shenstone.

They have been mentioned in the due chronological order of their births, which happens also to be the order of thought in respect to them. Shenstone, who was born in 1714, and died fifty years later, had the attraction, the freshness of dawn. As a country squireen he tried to show a "mind natural" at his small estate of the Leasowes; as a poet he wrote a "Pastoral Ballad" in four parts, exquisitely unreal, and admirably strenuous in its quest after reality; a charming Spenserian attempt, "The Schoolmistress," which owes nothing to Thomson; and a certain amount of miscellaneous verse, chiefly light, which has great merit. Indeed, even the poetasters of this period, or such persons as Byrom of Manchester, whom it would be unfair to call poetasters, though they cannot be called poets, are frequently excellent at this. But Shenstone, the most home-keeping of men, despite his love for inns, is in poetry all abroad. He does not know where he is; he does not know what he would be at, and he achieves *rococo* and *pastiche* because he will not be merely conventional in the ordinary way.

Collins.

Of Collins it is rather dangerous to speak, for very serious anathemas have been pronounced on anyone who will not avouch Collins to be a poet, a whole poet, and nothing but a poet. But any critic who is worth his critical salt is proof against all anathemas, except his own. Collins was born in 1721; he died at the age of thirty-eight; he had been infirm in mind for ten years earlier, and we have no work of his dating from these ten years. The handful of odes which he had written before his malady

would not, if printed in the ordinary fashion of new poetry, fill a hundred pages of twenty lines each. They include charming things—the famous "Passions," the exquisite "Dirge in Cymbeline," the beautiful "Lines on Thomson's Grave," and others. But the poet is singing in fetters—the fetters not of his madness but of his convention. Johnson, a good and true friend of Collins, and though an untrustworthy critic of purely romantic poetry, likely to be conciliated rather than revolted by the classical form of the odes, broke the truth bluntly when he said that Collins's inversion of phrase savoured of the mistake that "if you do not write prose you will write poetry." In no true poet known to me, not in Rossetti, not in Donne, is the drawback of artificial poetic diction so obnoxious as in Collins. And the reason is clear. He *was* a true poet, a poet of the truest, who, unluckily for him, was singing in the spirit of one age with the tongue of another. He is trying to say Shibboleth, but he cannot; and though he says Sibboleth with exquisite grace, it is Sibboleth still.

Gray had (except in pure poetic gift, wherein he was probably inferior) many advantages over Collins. He was quite sane; he was brought up in the best society; he never had any pecuniary difficulties; he lived comfortably if not merrily at Cambridge for the best part of his life of fifty-five years (1716-71), and he became a master of ancient and modern learning. He, too, had the true Romantic feeling, and he indulged it. But the cursed spite of his birth-year still refused him the Romantic organ, and he is in the twilight. He has left exceedingly little; the truth being, as I at least have no doubt, that he early found the hopeless divorce between his desires of conception and his powers of expression. What he has left, though not so exquisite as Collins, suffers a little less from the war between the law within and the law without; but as there is less internal genius, it is less interesting. The great "Elegy" is fine, no doubt, but the curse of Lamartine is on it; it is tepid, Laodicean, neither this nor that. Gray's great learning and his fine taste saved him in "The Bard" and "The Fatal Sisters" from the tawdry *pastiche* of Macpherson and the juvenile immaturity of Chatterton. But still, blasphemy as it may seem, I do not know that he is not at

Gray.

his best in purely light verse—like the epitaph of the pensive Selima, and the "Long Story"—a style where all his century is good, and in which delightful things may be found in unread pages of Smart and Whitehead.

Percy's "Reliques of English Poetry," the publication of which in 1765 may be said to have dealt a fatal, though not an immediately fatal, blow both to the classical and the semi-classical schools, may also be said to account for a certain wall of partition which stands between the poets just mentioned on the one hand, and Goldsmith and Chatterton on the other. Although Goldsmith was born as early as 1728, he did not write, or at least publish, at all early; and his "Traveller" did not appear till 1764 (nominally next year), his "Vicar of Wakefield" till 1766, his "Deserted Village" till 1770, and *She Stoops to Conquer* till 1773. Next year Goldsmith died, leaving, besides the famous things just mentioned, a mass of agreeable hack-work and some charming literature—the light poems of "Retaliation," the "Haunch of Venison," and others, the exquisite half-Addisonian, half-French essays of the "Citizen of the World," and the "Bee," etc. Some surprise may be felt at Goldsmith being classed with Chatterton as a post-Reliques man: but let us explain. In all considerable revolutions, political, literary, and other, the effect is two-fold. Some of the brighter spirits are thrown into violent revolt, and others (fewer generally but not less bright) into stiff reaction. Goldsmith was here the reactionary. Not only had he no critical head—his criticism of literature is usually as weak as his criticism of life is consummate; not only was he in all probability quite disposed to let his great friend the other Doctor (whom he regarded with a little not unjustified jealousy and a great deal of affectionate esteem) do his critical thinking for him; but though a charming writer of verse, he had little strictly poetical temperament. So he sneered at the new studies of old poets, carefully eschewed them himself, and is, in form and spirit, a strict "know-nothing" of the school of Pope.

Goldsmith.

It cannot quite be said that Chatterton is an equally strict know-nothing on the other side. Among the mass of precocious verse which the poor child left, there is a good deal which is not distinguishable from the

Chatterton.

ordinary verse of the versifiers of the time. But the work which has given him fame, and the positive value whereof is still rather a moot matter, was at the opposite pole. He was not directly inspired by Percy; for his famous "Rowley" imitations began in his twelfth year, 1764, before the "Reliques" appeared. It was thus a clear instance of the influence "in the air." How he multiplied these attempts, how he duped some ignorant and some not quite ignorant folk, how he had some success with newspapers, and even got a short play acted, how from April to August, 1770, he fought an unequal fight in London, and giving it up too hurriedly poisoned himself in Brook Street, Holborn, while he yet wanted three months of his nineteenth year—is known from a hundred histories and articles, plays and poems on the subject. That his imitations of the antique should ever have been taken for genuine merely shows that his contemporaries were more ignorant than he was, and that at the same time they shared his interest in the mediæval. There is more matter for debate in the positive value of his work, but it is not suitable for debate here. It is enough to say that when it is proved that anything more than promise is to be expected from seventeen, it will become more necessary than it is to inquire whether there is more than promise in Chatterton.

Of his fellow-witness—like him an unwilling one—to the almost indiscriminate appetite of the age for anything that was not modern, not clear, not correct, not prosaic—of "Ossian" Macpherson, enough has been said, and we must pass lightly over Churchill, a rather worthless man, and not a very worthy satirist, who died young, and whose true value (often overlooked) consists in his having reverted in decasyllabic practice to the model of Dryden rather than that of Pope, and having taught this to his very dissimilar schoolfellow Cowper. But the mention just made of *She Stoops to Conquer* may lead us from the poets to the playwrights, who are very interesting just here. It is more easy to devise than to approve explanations of the sudden brilliancy of playwriting in the eighth decade of the century. The acting of Garrick will not suffice; for Garrick had been acting long before. And though it might account for the activity and the success of respectable playwrights like Colman and Cumberland, Murphy and Mrs. Cowley, it will not account for

The Drama.

Goldsmith and Sheridan, especially for the latter. *She Stoops to Conquer*, admirable as it is, and still more the earlier *Goodnatured Man*, have, perhaps, more novel interest and literary merit than strictly dramatic genius. But the *School for Scandal* and the *Critic*, the *Rivals*, and even the *Duenna*, are plays pure and simple, and plays of a quality not merely delightful but great—the first three certainly great in their own kind. Croker and Tony Lumpkin would have been as much at home in prose narrative. But Puff, and Sir Anthony, and Joseph Surface, delightful as they are to read, are born of the boards, and only there on their native soil. That these fifteen or twenty years should have produced plays such as had not been seen for more than sixty years before, and, as some say, have not been seen for at least sixty years since, is something of a problem, explicable perhaps by fanciful and fatalist theory, less so by any sober demonstration of reason and fact.

Sheridan.

Less enigmatical, though to others than serious students perhaps less interesting, certainly less episodic and unconnected with things before and after, is the rise of the English historical school, which dates from our period, and which, if generosity and want of space did not prescribe the leaving of Gibbon (whose mighty work was half done in it) to the next, might be said to have attained its full, though far from its final perfection at this time. We were late with our great historians in England; but there was not, as in the other department of novel writing, an almost absolute absence of forerunners. The Elizabethan and Jacobean times had given us some worthy chroniclers, a splendid if unequal master of historical style in Raleigh, a scholarly and competent historian proper in Knolles. The period of the Civil Wars had, half by accident, given us the great genius of Clarendon in historical portraiture if not in history. But thereafter for a considerable time there was nothing; and we left to refugees like Rapin, or discharged ourselves, by respectable but hopeless persons like Carte and Harte, the duty of recounting the great argument of English and other history.

History.

There would be little profit in the endeavour to show by fanciful argument (which would be, as in the last case, as easy as it would be fanciful) why

Hume.

the want was supplied, to appearance all of a sudden, by David Hume (1711-76), and by his compatriot and ten years junior, William Robertson (1721-93). The accumulation of historical material, the great example of the French Benedictines as masters of research, and of the French historians from Mézeray onwards in matter of compilation, necessitated an attempt at synthetic history; while the instance of Conyers Middleton in his "Life of Cicero" was probably not without weight. That both Hume and Robertson were Scotchmen, who wrote with elaborate pains a sort of literary dialect rather than a vernacular, is probably a mere accident, not requiring anything more than indication.

It is much more to our purpose that they did, as a matter of fact, set the example of the popular literary history, and that this example was immediately followed and never let go. Hume's greatest work (p. 240) was not historical, and it falls out of our purview in this particular place; but his "History" would have been great enough. It still remains, unfortunately, the one example of a "History of England" on the great scale, written with a combination of intellectual grasp and literary style altogether above the average. The old accusations against its partisanship are ridiculous. Hume's Toryism did not lead him nearly so far from absolute impartiality as Lingard's "Popery," as Macaulay's Whiggishness, as Mr. Green's neo-Liberalism; and he compensated it by a sort of transcendence of humour which, unfortunately, none of these three shared. Much more serious defects, the first more or less unavoidable, the second the taint of the time, were the incompleteness of his information, and the rather cavalier fashion in which he treated what information he had. But it may be doubted whether his mastery of a sort—and a very excellent sort—of style did not compensate even for these.

Robertson.

Robertson, in comparison with Hume, had the disadvantage of less genius, and the advantage of a more single-minded devotion to the Historic Muse. His "History of Scotland" in 1758, and his "History of Charles V." eleven years later, brought him much fame, much money, a position rarely equalled; and he deserved all of these. For if these historians rather shock our modern prudery by neglecting "document" and detail, they have

over most of their successors (not Gibbon) the enormous advantage of not being blinded to the wood by the trees. They could take, and they did take, connected views; and these views, whatever small criticisms may be made on them by Dryasdust, were not merely often, but usually, of no ordinary truth and range.

Gibbon.

How this truth and range met (and some would say parted) once and for all with Gibbon, is not for us to tell. The limits assigned to this section already approach, and all the space that is left would hardly suffice to do the most summary justice to one who is, all things told and all things allowed for, the greatest historian of the world. Yet he was a typical man of this special time in his defects, if not in his merits; the incubation, the inception, and all but the finish of the "Decline and Fall" belong to this chapter; and the glory of him falls at least as much here as elsewhere, if not more.

Miscellanea.

Not quite so much can be said of Burke, for Burke's most splendid and monumental work — that in which he stemmed, and, more than anyone who wielded the pen, turned the tide of the French Revolution—is far ahead of us; while the placid talent of Reynolds, with its beginning of serious and accomplished writing on Art in England, can be postponed easily and with much propriety. But the period warns us of its approach to our own day by abounding with persons not epoch-making, not intrinsically great, but good enough to make the chronicler in however small a room rather reluctant to abandon them to utter oblivion. The Wesleys were great hymn-writers, and Charles, the younger (1708-78), was not a very small poet. In fiction the "Chrysal" of the almost unknown Charles Johnstone, an imitation of Smollett, which is the *locus classicus* for the unholy revels of Medmenham; Brooke's eccentric "Fool of Quality," a good book for an inn on a rainy afternoon, as the writer read it; and even the first work of Mackenzie, "The Man of Feeling," the author of which is familiar to us nearly sixty years later in Lockhart's "Scott"; —deserve at least mention. Anstey's "New Bath Guide" (1776), in a style which is neither poetical nor prosaic, had an influence on future light verse to which at least sufficient justice has been done, and may be granted by the sternest

critics the honour of having summed up and passed on the fleeting aptitudes of the century for such verse which have been already noticed. But without attempting to sweep into the net more persons of this kind, we must finish with a notice of the hitherto unnoticed Miscellanists, the precursors of the periodical and newspaper writing of later days.

Essayists.

The Essayists of the Addison tradition continued, and were, as has been seen, graced by the adhesion of men like Johnson and Goldsmith. But in this kind of writing the most notable examples were two men of rank who, like Congreve, would have pretended a wish to be considered only as gentlemen, but who were—the one not indifferent to, the other feverishly though covertly—ambitious of the favour of the Muses. One of them was Philip, Earl of Chesterfield; the other was Horace, who ended his life as an equally authentic Earl of Orford, but of whom, in this case not against his wish, one never speaks or thinks but as Horace Walpole.

Both were men essentially, and to an extraordinary degree, of their time; and as the one was nearly five-and-twenty years the junior of the other, they give us, in a manner not easily to be paralleled elsewhere, the eighteenth century as it showed itself, during almost its whole course, in persons of high rank, of complete education, and of very exceptional ability. Both were long-lived: Chesterfield, who was born in 1694, did not die till 1773, and Horace Walpole, who was born in 1717, after about the same complete span of life, died in 1797. Chesterfield, a statesman and a courtier, belonged rather to the age of patronage than that of performance, and rather to that of sterile correctness than to that of romantic quest. But his famous letters to his illegitimate son, his few "Characters," and his fewer verses show a man of extraordinary intellectual capacity, who might have done almost anything, and did do not a little. Walpole, a younger son and a man of little political and no statesmanlike ability, a virtuoso, a dilettante, an early if not altogether instructed convert to Gothic architecture and Renaissance bric-à-brac, to mediæval romance and to modern collecting, exhibits an entirely different and later stage of *ton*. Neither published very much; but while Chesterfield published hardly anything (the "Letters" were issued after his death by his daughter-in-law), Horace

Walpole, who possessed a private press, did not a little. His fame, however, does not rest on his "Royal and Noble Authors," nor on his "Mysterious Mother," nor even on his "Castle of Otranto," interesting as this is in the history of British fiction; but on his copious, various, and delightful letters, never yet collected in full, but always, in whatever collection, welcome. "Lady Mary"—*i.e.* Lady Mary Wortley Montagu—and Lord Hervey earlier had done something to set England not too far behind France in matter of Letters and Memoirs. Chesterfield did, perhaps, more still. But Walpole did most of all. The title of coxcomb, which has been scornfully awarded and indignantly repudiated, is too surely his; he had the faults to which those born on the fringe of the purple, as he was, are more liable than those born in the purple itself; he was (chiefly through wilfulness) a bad critic of other men's work, and for this or other reasons not too good a one of his own. But his work is delightful as literature and invaluable as history. Taken with Boswell's "Johnson," it supplies almost a complete view of the intellectual, social, and literary life of this period, certainly an indispensable companion to the due enjoyment and the due understanding of the "Ode on the Passions" and the "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," of "Tom Jones" and "Clarissa," and "Humphry Clinker" and "Tristram Shandy," of the "Rambler" and the "Decline and Fall," of *She Stoops to Conquer* and the *School for Scandal.*

Letters and Memoirs.

THE accession of George II. may be said to mark the dark hour that precedes the dawn. In 1727, the year of his accession, Hogarth, though only known as an ingenious designer, was twenty-nine; Richard Wilson was a boy of thirteen. Reynolds was a child of four, and Francis Cotes was two years old. Gainsborough was an infant in arms; Romney and Wright of Derby came a few years later. But the Court was not much less a foreign Court under George II. than it had been under his father. Neither cared a jot for art, and viewed with equal indifference the claims of the foreign

R. HUGHES. Art: Painting.

Signs of a New Era.

and the native artist. Nevertheless, there was a marked impulse in the direction of art connoisseurship—not always, perhaps, according to knowledge—under George II. In 1734 the Dilettanti Society was established by a group of "five gentlemen," who, having travelled in Italy, were "desirous of encouraging at home a taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad." Of course, in 1734, no stigma attached to the name by which these gentlemen dubbed their society. Many of them were expert virtuosi, some men of real science. They organised expeditions for archæological research, published travels in the countries where art formerly flourished, established art studentships, and generally fulfilled the functions of a committee of taste. In this they were supported by the Society of Arts, founded nineteen years later, and somewhat more utilitarian in its aims. Both societies established prizes for competition among artists, and lent their rooms for exhibitions, and extended to art and artists a patronage which, if not always enlightened, was consistent and sincere. If the Court was not munificent in its dealings with artists of native birth, it was not more so with the immigrants from abroad, though some foreigners of distinction, like Leotard and Canaletti, made England for a time their home. Jervas and Richardson and Hayman the scene-painter were, at first, the leading spirits in the world of Art. They were succeeded by Thomas Hudson, who, until the rise of Reynolds, was the fashionable painter of England. His *chef d'œuvre*, such as it is, was the family group he executed for Charles, Duke of Marlborough; but as he did not paint it until the sixth decade of the century, he probably had by that time learned something from the younger generation which he affected to despise. The knowledge and insight of this most successful painter may be fitly gauged by his contempt for his pupil Reynolds, whom he characterised as an artist "who will never distinguish himself." As a rule, our indigenous painters in the early years of George II. deserve the oblivion into which they have fallen. Always, of course, excepting Hogarth, whose genius fills the stage until the entrance of Reynolds and his contemporaries.

The Dilettanti Society.

The Study of Art.

Thomas Hudson.

Hogarth: his Work.

Probably no great artist had so curiously limited a gift as Hogarth. Without any feeling for the highest qualities of beauty, indifferent to the subtle attractions of colour and modelling, without a scrap of poetry in his composition, he did, perhaps, more for the art of his country than any other Englishman before or since. He found English art a mass of insincerity and affectation, without honesty of purpose, without nobility of aim, and unredeemed by fine qualities of hand. He brought truth into the studio and drove imposture out. He taught the world that the men and women of the Georgian era were, after all, more worthy of representation than the creations of a sham mythology, and that the tragedy of daily existence offered finer subjects for the pencil than the fictitious woes of gods and shepherdesses. Even Beer Street and Gin Lane in London better served the artist's purpose than a Frenchified and salacious Arcadia.

His Life.

Hogarth was born in Bartholomew Close on the 10th of November, 1697. His father, though the son of a poor Westmoreland farmer, was a man of some education, and made a shift to live partly as a corrector of the press, partly as a Grub Street author. By his own desire, his son William was apprenticed to Gamble, a silver-plate engraver in Cranbourne Alley. Soon he began to draw on the copper, and his earliest work after serving his apprenticeship was his own business card, "W. Hogarth, engraver. Aprill ye 23rd, 1720." From business cards and bill-heads he passed to plates and satirical designs, and thence to illustrations of books like the travels of "Aubry de la Motraye" and Briscoe's "Apuleius." These are not yet characteristic, but in 1724 he published the "Taste of the Town," ridiculing the fashionable Jack of all trades, William Kent. This seems to have been the first print he published on his own account. It was followed by his caricature of Kent's Altar-piece, and the illustrations to "Hudibras." These last, though founded on the work of another, contain much coarse and vivid humour, the product of Hogarth's brain, and, indeed, are thoroughly "Hogarthian." As the rivalry of Kent and Thornhill was then very bitter, the attacks on the former brought Hogarth into favour with Thornhill, who admitted him to his studio,

Early Works.

and gave him instructions in oil-painting. He commenced to paint family groups—small conversation pieces, as he calls them—a class of subject in which he acquired considerable skill. In 1729 he ran away with Thornhill's daughter, but the estrangement between the families was so far from serious that Lady Thornhill was suspected of connivance. Soon after his marriage he began the first of the two "Progresses" which have immortalised his name. It is characteristic of the coarseness of the man and of the age that he should have selected such a subject as "The Harlot's Progress" at such a moment. This series of six pictures is a microcosm of Hogarth's art—an art incomparably ingenious in narration, piquant and unflagging in interest, and entirely dramatic. But there is not one spark of tenderness in "The Harlot's Progress" from end to end. The country girl, picked up by the procuress in the first picture, deserves her fate, according to Hogarth, as she passes through the rank good fortune of the Jew's mistress to Bridewell and hard labour, "to disease and death, to a shameful funeral and a forgotten grave." In the very last act of all the artist is unrelenting. There is no mourning for the harlot. Even her child is not impressed; he winds up his top in the foreground—"the only thing in that assembly," says Elia, "that is not a hypocrite." Absence of tenderness is still more visible in the subsequent series, "The Rake's Progress." In these pictures, almost for the first and last time, there is an attempt at pathos. The girl that Tom Rakewell has seduced is introduced several times. In the first picture he casts her off; in the fourth she offers him her purse to pay the debt for which he is arrested. In the seventh and last of the scenes she tries to comfort her seducer, now an incurable maniac in Bedlam. But in all these cases the sentimental or pathetic motive is handled without any real sympathy, and without a trace of the vigour and ingenuity with which he emphasises the more repulsive incidents. It must be remembered, in judging of these works as pictures, that both series were painted with the view of their reproduction as prints, for it is as a *peintre-graveur*, and not otherwise, that Hogarth must be judged.

"The Harlot's Progress."

"The Rake's Progress."

But between the dates of issue of "The Harlot's Progress"

and "The Rake's Progress," Hogarth contrived to lay the foundation of the English law of copyright in design. In concert with George Virtue and others interested in engraving, he petitioned Parliament for an Act to vest in the designer the exclusive copyright in his works. Their prayer was granted in the Bill which received the Royal Assent on the 15th of May, 1735, just in time to enable the series of "The Rake's Progress" to get the protection of the Act. Before his death Hogarth was able to write that he had thus "made prints a considerable article of commerce of this country, there being now more business of this kind done here than in Paris, or anywhere else, and as well." Unquestionably Hogarth had now found his true vocation, though he hankered always after "the great style of history painting," a style in which he was quite unfitted to succeed. His own account of the matter is "that finding that Religion, the great promoter of this style in other countries, rejected it in England, he was unwilling to sink into a portrait manufacturer, and, still ambitious of being singular, dropped all expectations of advancement from that source."

Hogarth and Copyright.

Hogarth, though he owed but little to any regular training, was not unmindful of the advantages that training brings; and when, at Thornhill's death (in 1734), he found himself, as he expresses it, "in possession of his neglected apparatus," he hired the studio of Roubillac, in Peter's Court, St. Martin's Lane, and, with the aid of a few other artists, started a life school. This, with characteristic insularity, he declared to be "to every useful purpose equal to that in France, or any other." Here, at any rate, the greater part of the later artists of the reign of George II. were trained, and it continued to flourish until 1768, when "the apparatus" was transferred to the newly-founded Royal Academy. A more doubtful service to art was his unremitting hostility to what he called the "Black Masters," or rather to those examples of them which were forced on the English public by picture dealers.* For, talking to Mrs. Piozzi of Dr. Johnson, he declared that his

His Work for Art-Education.

* An entertaining account of their artifices is given in Hogarth's letter to the *St. James's Evening Post* in defence of Sir James Thornhill's paintings, signed "Britophil" (1737: Dobson, "Hogarth," p. 69).

conversation was to other men's what Titian's painting was to Hudson's. "But," he hastened to add, "don't you tell people now that I say so, for the connoisseurs and I are at war, you know; and because I hate them they think I hate Titian—and let them."

He certainly was at great pains to give the world at large the notion that he detested and despised foreign art. In season and out of season he never wearied in his hostility. At his famous auction, in February, 1745, he issued a ticket admitting the holder "to be a bidder (if he thinks it proper) for Mr. Hogarth's pictures," and on it he depicts a fight between them and the Black Masters. A kneeling Magdalen digs a hole in the unfortunate Harlot; a St. Francis is equally discourteous to the inimitable prude in "Morning"; the tavern scene in "The Rake's Progress" cleaves its way through a Titian's "Feast of Olympus," and a "Midnight Modern Conversation" disperses Rubens's "Bacchanals." Obviously, it was not the blackness of the Old Masters that was their chief crime in Hogarth's eyes. The prices which the painter's works fetched on this occasion are worth recording:—

	£	s.	d.
Six "Harlot's Progress" at 14 guineas each ...	88	4	0
Eight "Rake's Progress" at 22 guineas each ...	184	16	0
"Morning," 20 guineas	21	0	0
"Noon," 37 guineas	38	17	0
"Evening," 38 guineas...	39	18	0
"Night," 26 guineas	27	6	0
"Strolling Players," 26 guineas	27	6	0
	£427	7	0

"The Marriage à la Mode."

The year 1745, when the sale we have mentioned took place, Hogarth's art was absolutely at its zenith. It was the year of the completion of "The Marriage à la Mode," the artist's masterpiece in satirical *genre*, and the year before his portrait of Simon Fraser Lord Lovat, his masterpiece of portraiture. Probably not only for dramatic power, but for mere handicraft skill, the second picture of the "Marriage" series may be considered his high-water mark.

The scope of the present work forbids the attempt adequately to review the work of this great artist. Our wonder

at his greatness is not lessened by remembering what manner of man he was. Fortunately for us, he painted himself as he wished us to remember him, and the portrait is a veritable masterpiece of compendious biography. He shows us a homely, plebeian, pugnacious, unrefined personage, clear-eyed and matter-of-fact—not a great student, not a great thinker, but a straightforward searcher after the truth as he saw it. It is unnecessary to insist further on the limitations of his gift. His portraits, except where his sitter's face and figure lent themselves to satire, are undoubtedly commonplace. He could paint the grossness and treachery of Lord Lovat, or the humorous devilry of Wilkes, with *verve* and insight, but his "Captain Coram at the Foundling," though not an unpleasing picture, is a type of benevolent commonplace. His "Sigismunda," though even in colour and most carefully painted, is curiously wanting in force, and his sacred pictures, like the "Paul before Felix," in the lobby of Lincoln's Inn, have all the faults of the worst of the Black Masters. The figure of Paul might, indeed, well pass for an execrable example of the decadent schools of Italy. Nevertheless, he founded a school —mainly, it is true, a school of caricature, but none the less a genuine school. Hogarth's influence not only touched Gilray and Rowlandson, but it reached the Cruickshanks and the elder Doyle. Some may fancy that they note a reflexion of the satire of the "Progresses" in the rare moments of Leech's satire, and even in artists of a still later date. But, however much he has been excelled in some respects by the workers in black-and-white of the nineteenth century, England's greatest dramatic draughtsman he must always be.

Hogarth's School.

Hogarth's has been a healthy influence, too; for though, as we have said, he was poorly equipped in feeling for beauty of form, and he was far from being a great colourist, yet his execution was firm, his handling facile, and his colour sober and sometimes felicitous. But as his biographer has said once and for all, in a summing up which it would be wrong to attenuate by any addition, neither by his achievements as an engraver, nor by his merits as a painter, does he retain his unique position among English artists. "It is as a pictorial chronicler of life and manners, as a satirist and humourist upon canvas,

His Position as an Artist.

that he makes his chief claim upon posterity. His skill in seizing upon the ridiculous and the fantastic was only equalled by his power of rendering the tragic and the terrible. And it was not only given to him to see unerringly and to select unfalteringly, but to this was added a rare and special faculty for narrative by action. Other artists have succeeded in single scenes of humorous *genre*, or in isolated effects of passion and horror, but none has combined both with such signal ability, and carried them from one canvas to another with such assured dexterity, as this dramatist of the brush. To take some social blot, some burning fashionable vice, and hold it up sternly to 'hard hearts'; to imagine it vividly, and body it forth with all the resources of unshrinking realism; to tear away its conventional trappings; to probe it to the quick, and lay bare its secret shameful workings to their inevitable end; to play upon it with inexhaustible ingenuity, with the keenest and happiest humour; to decorate it with the utmost profuseness of fanciful accessory and suggestive detail; to be conscious at the gravest how the grotesque in life elbows the pathetic, and the strange, grating laugh of Mephistopheles is heard through the sorriest story. These were his gifts and this was his vocation—a vocation in which he has never yet been rivalled."

Landscape Painting: Richard Wilson.

If we may look upon Hogarth as the founder of *genre* painting in England, we may with equal justice regard Richard Wilson as the founder of English landscape, though not exactly of English modern landscape. He was Hogarth's junior by sixteen years, having been born in August, 1714, at Penagoes, a village in Montgomeryshire, of which his father was parson. He appears to have exhibited a natural aptitude for painting, for he was sent to London and placed in the studio of an obscure portrait painter named Wright. He himself started as a portrait painter, and though such portraits of his as we have do not exhibit any distinction, yet among his contemporaries a colourist like Wilson might easily have deserved a considerable popularity. At any rate, he was patronised by royalty, as appears by the portraits of "the Prince of Wales and Duke of York" now in the National Portrait Gallery. Up to the age of thirty-six he seems not only to have supported himself by his gains as a painter of likenesses, but to have

Early Life.

saved sufficient money to enable him to realise the dream of his life—a visit to Italy.

In 1750 accordingly we find him in Italy, where he fell in with two painters whose influence determined his future career. The first, whom he encountered at Venice, was Zuccarelli, a master of artificial prettiness in the so-called classical manner. It is greatly to his credit that he recognised in Wilson a master talent, and urged him to devote his whole time to landscape. In Rome he found Claude Joseph Vernet, who, if brought up in a bad school, was not far from being a great master, and who reinforced Zuccarelli's recommendation. Wilson fell greatly under Vernet's influence, which was probably unfortunate, for, to Vernet, the country round the Eternal City (where he lived for twenty years) meant the entire world of landscape, and he communicated some of this narrowness of view to Wilson. At any rate, during the six years of his stay in Rome Wilson developed into a considerable landscape painter, with more than a slight mastery of that golden hazy sunlight in which his French friend excelled. Backed by Vernet's recommendations, he appears to have made enough to live on there; but in 1757 he quitted Italy for England, and set up in London as a landscape painter pure and simple. A taste for landscape, whence arising it is not easy to determine, had sprung up in England, and promised well for Richard Wilson's future. But his hopes were doomed to disappointment. Zuccarelli had been before him, and he found the market glutted with the theatrical prettinesses of the Italian. It is significant that in less than ten years of sojourn here Zuccarelli amassed a fortune by his brush, while a quarter of a century of conscientious labour found "Poor Dick," as his friends called him, within a measurable distance of starvation. In 1768, when the Royal Academy was founded, Wilson was one of the original members, and he afterwards obtained the post of Librarian to the Academy, which probably saved him from actual want. It is said that Penny informed him, soon after his return to England, that he must adopt the lighter style of Zuccarelli if he wanted to succeed, and probably he was right; but Wilson refused—and starved.

Adopts Landscape Painting.

Later, he suffered from the competition of Gainsborough's

work, and from the reaction against the classical treatment of landscape. Mr. Ruskin has, indeed, accused Wilson of issuing "mere diluted adaptations of Poussin and Salvator," and of gathering his material in an abnormal district, the Campagna; but the criticism is obviously extravagant. Certainly his pictures show the influence of the artists whose follower he was, as well as of the scenes in which he learned his art. His foliage recalls Claude and Poussin; there is a flavour of the Campagna about his Welsh landscape; and the texture of his rocks is apt to suggest tufa rather than the Cambrian series. But his landscapes are full of noble qualities. They are broad and solid, essentially conceived in the grand style, and impressive in composition. Though now mostly darkened by age, they are frequently fine in colour, while the golden glow of the Italian sun still lives in many of his skies. To the day of his death fortune never came to him, but he was always faithful to his art; and though, in his lifetime, he had few imitators, posterity has done him justice.

Wilson's Contemporaries.

How considerable an artist in landscape Wilson was can be gauged, to some extent, by considering the work of his more successful contemporaries, Zuccarelli, George Lambert, and the Smiths of Chichester. In their work we have all the mannerisms of Claude and Poussin—the classical temples and nymphs under the trees, without any trace of that largeness of feeling which redeems in great part the older masters' artificiality. Yet George Smith's imitations fetched far higher prices than Wilson's; and in a landscape competition, instituted at the Society of Arts, he carried away the prize from him.

Marine Painters.

A few sea-painters deserve to be remembered. Peter Monamy lived and worked till 1749, and Samuel Scott continued the tradition of the Vandeveldes in representing "the calm plane of the ocean level." Indeed, Horace Walpole goes so far as to call him the first painter of the age. He painted a few landscapes also, and, if somewhat mechanical, was a sound draughtsman. He was almost contemporary with Wilson, having been born in 1710 and dying in 1772. Much the same may be said of George Brooking, Richard Paton, and William James, who a little later had considerable vogue, and who were probably

influenced by Canaletto, who came to England in 1746. That famous artist stayed here two years, and seems to have found the monotony of London brick, and the cooler tones of our northern climate, more congenial to his unimaginative temperament than the marble splendours and flooding sunlight of his native Venice. Perhaps the earliest nature painter who shows a following after Wilson was the Irishman, George Barret, of Dublin, who, though more artificial in treatment than Wilson, had a more considerable vogue. It is said that he was in receipt of £2,000 per annum from his landscapes at a time when Wilson was starving in an obscure lodging at the corner of North Street, Fitzroy Square. He died in 1784, two years after his greater but less fortunate contemporary.

The Great Portrait Painters.

We have seen how, during the reign of George II., English *genre* sprang, as it were, fully equipped from the brain of Hogarth, and how Wilson painted the first great English landscapes. The same reign witnessed equally the budding, if not the full bloom, of our national school of portraiture. This school, in the persons of Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney, was destined to the highest distinction, and, indeed, made the eighteenth century the golden age of English art. Of that famous triumvirate Gainsborough was the deftest, Romney the most graceful and engaging, but Reynolds was unmistakably the greatest. He led the way, and to his other laurels those of the pioneer must be added. The sudden rise of the school at this particular moment is singular, for, if we except the work of the Scotchman, Allan Ramsay, which is always virile and unaffected, portraiture in England was then at almost its lowest ebb. From Vandyck to Lely, from Lely to Kneller, from Kneller to Hudson, the art had not been at a standstill, but its movement had been uniformly downwards.

It was in the studio of the lowest member in the descending series that Reynolds acquired the rudiments of his profession. He was the son of a poor Devonshire vicar who eked out his slender stipend by keeping a school, and at eighteen was placed with Hudson. His father, a kindly but hardly a talented man, gave his son a respectable if not a very high education, and, which is more important, imbued him with a really fine appreciation of what we now call culture. How he worked, or what teaching he

received in Hudson's studio in Great Queen Street, cannot be determined, but he probably carried away very little. In after years he used to lament the lack of an academical education and his want of that "facility of drawing the naked figure which an artist ought to have." At any rate, though it had been arranged that he should be with Hudson for four years, he quitted him after two, and returning to Devonshire, set up as a portrait-painter at what was then known as Plymouth Dock, and is now known as Devonport. For a time he became the fashion there; but the fashion passed, and he returned to London. Then, for two years (1744 to 1746), he painted portraits in the Metropolis, in which, as has been well said, "we can see the pupil struggling against the thraldom of the master." But his father's death removed him from the dangerous proximity and advice of Hudson, and he returned once more to Plymouth. There he was fortunate in encountering a local artist, William Gandy, a ne'er-do-weel of genuine talent, whose homely maxim, that "a picture ought to have a richness in its texture, as if the colours were made of cream and cheese," was a valuable truth to a lad who had been taught to take the wooden similitudes of Hudson for works of art. It is clear that his progress was already considerable. His portrait of Lady Somers, which was painted 1747-8, shows us a Reynolds, youthful, perhaps, and immature, but recognisably Reynolds, and a Reynolds completely emancipated from the evil traditions of Great Queen Street.

Reynolds: Early Training.

A rare accident—the fact that Admiral Keppel, at a chance meeting in the big house at Mount Edgcumbe, took a fancy to him—led to the fulfilment of the dream of all painters, a visit to Italy. Keppel took him there in his ship, the *Centurion*, and after some delay at Minorca and various places, which Reynolds utilised to practise his trade, he was finally landed at Leghorn at the close of 1750. His visit lasted less than three years, a little more than two of which were spent in Rome, some four or five months being allotted to Florence and Venice and the rest of Italy. But he came back a great painter, with what he called his "indigested notions" totally done away with. In January, 1753, he established himself

Visit to Italy.

permanently in London, and thenceforward almost till his death, thirty-nine years later, he laboured incessantly at the production of that noble series of portraits which have made the name of "Sir Joshua" a synonym for masterly characterisation. When we say that he came back a great artist we do not mean to say that his development was completed; his artistic life was a long struggle for improvement, and it was only in his last years, after his paralytic stroke, that he reached that Venetian fulness of colour for which he had been striving all his life. But in 1753 he painted the portrait of his great friend, Admiral Keppel, and this *beau idéal* of the resolute and intrepid sailor, if it had been his first and last work, would have stamped its author as a master of his means. It is, perhaps, hardly an exaggeration to say that character had never been so painted in England in the memory of living men, and small wonder is it that this picture brought the author instant fame and the promise of fortune. Noblemen crowded to the studio, and everybody who claimed to be somebody came to Reynolds to be painted. His studio, as one of his numerous biographers has said, was "crowded with women who wished to be transmitted as angels, as well as men who wished to appear as heroes and philosophers." And he retained this amazing popularity to the end of his life. Other painters—great men like Gainsborough and Romney, and strong men like Opie, seemed for a moment to dispute the pride of place with him; but except for a short time, when Romney was the rage of the greater half of the town, his supremacy was never seriously threatened.

His Reputation Made.

It may be of interest to trace the swelling tide of his success, according to the prosaic scale of the prices asked and obtained. The late Richard Redgrave, R.A., gives us the facts on this head as follows:—

Growth of his Popularity.

"Farington tells us that while Reynolds resided in St. Martin's Lane his prices for portraits were—three-quarters, ten guineas; half-length, twenty guineas; whole length, forty guineas. His master Hudson's prices were rather higher, and were soon adopted by him. About four or five years later both raised their prices to fifteen, thirty, and sixty guineas for the three classes of portrait respectively. In 1760 Reynolds removed to Leicester Square, and then his prices were twenty-five, fifty, and one hundred guineas for the three classes of portrait. In 1781, we

learn from Malone, his prices were fifty, one hundred, and two hundred guineas, and continued so till his death. For the 'Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse,' in the Dulwich Gallery, Mr. Desenfans paid him seven hundred guineas. For the priceless 'Strawberry Girl,' the 'Muscipula,' and the 'Shepherd Boy,' his price was fifty guineas each. For his historical works he was paid at about the same rate—the 'Death of Dido,' now in the Royal Collection, two hundred guineas; 'Death of Cardinal Beaufort,' five hundred guineas; and for his Russian picture, 'Hercules strangling the Serpents,' fifteen hundred guineas."

His Work as an Artist.

Before touching on his share in the establishment of the Royal Academy, and the work of his great contemporaries exhibited there, an endeavour must be made to define, however imperfectly, the contribution made by Reynolds to the growth of English art. "You don't paint like Sir Godfrey," they said to Reynolds; and, fortunately for the world, the charge was true. The *mesne*, or general portrait of Kneller, with its conventional aims, passed into the *néant* with the coming of Sir Joshua. The individual portrait was the portrait of Sir Joshua. In him the gift of painting men and women was supreme. Not only did he paint them in their habit as they lived, but with such masterly suggestion of character as was practically unknown amongst the men of his generation. His gift of portraiture of living people was "a power so accomplished in him that nothing is left to future masters but to add the calm of perfect workmanship to his vigour and felicity of perception." A singularly calm and genial temper was joined to an astonishing alertness of observation, and these gifts were trained by constant and varied practice. Always on the watch for the turn of the head, the uplifting of the hand, the bending or stiffness of the figure, he never seems to have failed to recognise the really differential note of character. And he indicated these things with extraordinary subtlety. In particular, he divined the character of children with unfailing accuracy and sympathy. As has been very perfectly said, Reynolds has the secret of all the characteristic graces of women and children. He renders with astonishing facility the most fugitive impressions. The innocent delight of the mother, the ingenuousness as well as the hidden passion of the maiden, the wonder, the naïve *gaucherie*, the pretty, rebellious, coaxing ways of the child, with its firm rosy flesh—of all this he has gathered the charm

and extracted the perfume. And the secret of this success is the union in the painter, not only of the artist's gift of observation, but of the artist's passion for beauty and the noble optimism of the man.

So far we have dealt, however perfunctorily, with Sir Joshua's reforms in matters of artistic principle, in the things which concern the higher moralities of painting. As regards minor details, which constitute, as it were, the manners of the art, the changes he introduced were equally noteworthy. By the fashionable painters of the time neither flesh, nor drapery, nor character, nor attitude was the object of serious effort. A conventional arrangement of folds did duty for dress. Faces were painted according to a recipe, and the surface thus mechanically obtained did duty for all complexions. The attitudes of men and women were fixed by the fashion, or according to their rank, real or assumed. The expression of character did not get beyond the conventional rakishness of the man about town, or the conventional modishness of the *grande dame du monde*. Reynolds changed all this. Without being a great flesh painter, his somewhat loose handling—his *pennello volante*, as Angelica Kauffmann called it—gave a texture in which there was always a play of light and shadow, sometimes a genuine sparkle and vivacity. He seized the individual attitude, the idiosyncratic gesture, whether it was Mrs. Siddons turning to look at something on the wall, or Sir James Hunter falling into a brown study, or the child climbing on its mother's back. He sought and found the movement that differentiates the sitter. He drew the dress as he saw it, arranged, no doubt, but the real thing that the limbs underneath informed, were it a duchess's chiffons or an admiral's uniform. And as for character, no depth was too deep, no frivolity too *passager*, for him to catch.

His Limitations.

The limitations and deficiencies of Sir Joshua's art more readily lend themselves to a summary indication than its admirable qualities. We have already endeavoured to suggest how great a painter of real men and women, and, above all, of children, he was. Nor did it matter whether they were clothed in the workaday garb of the eighteenth century, or masqueraded as historical or mythological personages, as Cupid or Circe, as Lesbia or Harry

VIII. He painted them, as we have seen, with the most complete success, with the utmost simplicity, and without a hint of staginess, yet with rare dignity and distinction. But when he attempted historical and religious subjects his failure is no less complete. His heroes and his saints, his Ugolinos and Holy Families, are unique in their combination of the stagey with the commonplace. He looked up to the religious masterpieces of the Italians with awe and reverence; he was for ever singing the praises of a lofty ideal in art, but he rarely felt courage for grappling with it. His admiration, his enthusiasm for the Old Masters was profound and sincere to the day of his death. In the concluding lecture of the course that he delivered to the students—the last, as it proved, that he was ever to deliver—he thus spoke of Michael Angelo:—

"Were I now to begin the world again I would tread in the steps of that great master: to kiss the hem of his garment, to catch the slightest of his perfections, would be glory and distinction enough for an ambitious man. I feel a self-congratulation in knowing myself capable of such sensations as he intended to excite. I reflect, not without vanity, that these Discourses bear testimony of my admiration of that truly divine man; and I should desire that the last words which I should pronounce in this Academy, and from this place, might be the name of Michael Angelo."

But, as Mr. Ruskin says, he never thought of following out the purpose of Michael Angelo and "painting a Last Judgment upon Squires with the scene of it laid in Leicestershire." And we may be thankful that he did not. His drawing of the more familiar accessories was facile and accurate, but he was occasionally careless; his dogs and horses are conventional, while the live panther in "Circe" appears to be execrably stuffed.

His Artistic Methods.

The defects of Reynolds's methods are so intimately bound up with his excellencies that it is difficult to sever them. When he told his pupils, "Consider the object before you as more made out by light and shadow than by lines," he gave them the advice that he always followed. "He never seems to have seen outline," says a professional critic, "but the whole as a picture—its breadth, colour, light and shade. His eye was always dwelling on the relation of parts, and of the figure to the ground. When it melted into the ground he was not seeking

to find the form, but was content, with Nature, to lose it. Even the light and shade seems to be considered less as light and shade than as different modifications of a coloured surface, which one may suppose him mentally matching as a lady does her silks. Yet compared with the great masters of his idolatry, Giorgione, Titian, and Tintoret (for Rembrandt, strangely enough, he failed to appreciate), his work is, to quote Mr. Ruskin once more, "at its best, only magnificent sketching." Yet for giving the effects that he aimed at, what method could have been better? Its very slightness is engaging, and addresses itself "purposefully to the casual glance and common thought—eager to arrest the passer-by, but careless to detain him, or detaining him, if at all, by an unexplained enchantment, not by continuance of teaching or development of idea."

The worst result of Reynolds's manipulation was the want of permanence in his pictures. True follower as he was of the Italians, he paid somewhat dearly for his devotion. For he owed his deafness to a cold caught in the corridors of the Vatican; and to his persistent search after "the secret of the Venetians" we may attribute those experiments in colour which have worked the ruin of a majority of his pictures. He himself deplored that he was not early instructed in the principles of colouring, and saw that his unsteadiness and fickleness of mode "arose from an eager desire to attain the highest excellence." Modern expert opinion declares that he used wax and all kinds of improper vehicles, and habitually combined such as are, to use a medical phrase, "incompatibles." He placed soft media under hard, rapidly-drying media under slowly-drying ones, and used for his glazings uncertain vegetable pigments, or mineral pigments rendered unsuitable by unscientific combination. Beautiful results were thus undoubtedly obtained, but they were generally evanescent. Some of his pictures failed soon after they left the easel, many in the lifetimes of the sitters, so that the epigram attributed to Sir Walter Blackett only expressed the melancholy truth:—

> "Painting of old was surely well designed
> To keep the features of the dead in mind;
> But this great rascal has reversed the plan,
> And made the picture die before the man."

But though we have to deplore the fact that many of his early pictures are but the bloodless phantoms of their former selves, and that many of his latter works are blurred by a swarthy covering of oxidised varnish, there are qualities of distinction even in these ruins that we look for in vain in the work of any other Englishman.

The life of Reynolds, his friendships and his dislikes, the quarrels which momentarily ruffled the placid flow of his singularly beautiful life, cannot be here recounted. But there is one incident with which his name is associated that must be mentioned, as it forms an epoch in the history of English art, and influences it to the present hour. This was the foundation of the Royal Academy, in the year 1768. Of course, the idea of such an institution was no new thing. In 1711 Kneller and some of his followers had endeavoured to establish a national school for drawing. We have already noticed Thornhill's academy, carried on later by Hogarth, and which, under Moser, had experienced various vicissitudes. But in 1760, after the first exhibition in the Adelphi, "The Society of Artists" established annual exhibitions, and in 1765 obtained a royal charter of incorporation under that name. It provided for a directorate of twenty-four, to whom the election of fellows was intrusted. The painters Wilson, Hayman, Moser, were among the first directors, as were the architects Paine and Chambers, McArdell the engraver, and Wilton the sculptor. But fellows and directors never seemed able to agree, and fierce internecine quarrels ensued. At length, at a meeting held in October, 1768, the directors were crushed by a general vote of the fellows; sixteen were refused re-election, and the rest resigned.

The Royal Academy.

Its Predecessors.

An attempt was then made to set up a rival society, and Benjamin West, who, though recently established in London, had the ear of the Court, contrived to explain that the directors were not responsible for what his Majesty called "these indecent bickerings." Chambers, who was architect to the king, was deputed to wait on him, and to humbly inform him that many artists of reputation, together with himself, were desirous of establishing a society that should more especially promote the arts of design, and praying his Majesty's gracious patronage. The king was favourably

disposed, and an outline of the scheme, drawn up by Moser, Chambers, and Francis Cotes, was submitted for the royal consideration and, after some negotiation, approved. It was the universal opinion among the artists that Reynolds's co-operation was necessary. He had some time before resigned his membership of the old society, which was temporarily presided over by Kirby, whose position was probably due to the fact that he had been the king's drawing-master. For some unexplained reason great secrecy had been observed, and Reynolds was kept in ignorance of what was going on. By the 9th of November, 1768, matters had progressed so far that a list of members had been made out, and a meeting of the artists was fixed to take place at Wilton's house, to nominate the officials. What took place in regard to Reynolds has often been debated.*

Its Foundation.

On the next day, the 10th of November, the king formally approved and signed the instrument incorporating the Academy, and the first general meeting of the newly-constituted body took place on the 14th of November, 1768. The instrument declares that the members of the Royal Academy shall not be members of any other Society of Artists established in London—a provision palpably directed against the Incorporated Society, and excluding from the new Academy Romney, Allan Ramsay, Hudson, and, it would seem for the moment, Gainsborough.

"There are at this time," said the new President, in his discourse delivered at the opening of the Academy, "a greater number of excellent artists than were ever before at one period in this nation"; and, though they were not all members of the Academy, the statement was undoubtedly true. Who these "excellent artists" were may be gathered from the list of the first members of the Academy in the catalogue to the first exhibition, containing the following names, amongst which will be noticed those of seven foreigners and two ladies:—

Its First Members.

* Messrs. Leslie and Tom Taylor, who had access to the original minute books of the Academy, assert authoritatively that Reynolds, after much hesitation (Kirby having led him to believe that the design lacked the Royal sanction) was at length persuaded by West to attend the preliminary meeting, that he arrived late as it was just breaking up, but that on his arrival the rules were passed, and the Academy was formally constituted.

"Sir Joshua Reynolds, President; Sir William Chambers, Treasurer; George Michael Moser, Keeper; Francis Milner Newton, Secretary; Edward Penny, Professor of Painting; Thomas Sandby, Professor of Architecture; Samuel Wale, Professor of Perspective; William Hunter, M.D., Professor of Anatomy; Francis Hayman, Librarian; Tan-Chet-Tua (a Chinese modeller, apparently a sort of Honorary Academician); George Barrett; Francesco Bartolozzi; Edward Burch; Agostino Carlini; Charles Catton; Mason Chamberlin; J. Baptist Cipriani; Richard Cosway; John Gwynn; William Hoare; Nathaniel Hone; Mrs. Angelica Kauffmann; Jeremiah Meyer; Mrs. Mary Moser; Joseph Nollekens; John Richards; Paul Sandby; Domenic Serres; Peter Toms; William Tyler; Benjamin West; Richard Wilson; Joseph Milton; Richard Yeo; John Zoffany; Francesco Zuccarelli."

Gainsborough's name is wanting, but it was probably an oversight, as in the body of the first official catalogue we find the letters "R.A." placed against his name. It is probable that Romney's name was omitted purposely (p. 298). At any rate, he never sent any pictures to the Academy's exhibitions, and never sought to be enrolled among its members. Gainsborough, on the other hand, if he took little interest in its proceedings, was for many years a regular contributor.

Its Earliest Exhibition.

It is interesting to learn what "the pictures of the year" were, in the year 1 of the exhibition, and they are worth enumerating for the indication thus afforded of the direction of the public taste and of the artistic talent which satisfied it. The president exhibited four canvases, including the group of Mrs. Bouverie and Mrs. Crewe, and the masterpiece of Miss Morris as "Hope nursing Love." Other attractions were—Francis Cotes's "Hebe"; Angelica Kauffmann's "Hector and Andromache" and "Venus directing Aeneas"; Nathaniel Dance's portraits of the king and queen; Hone's "Piping Boy"; Cipriani's "Annunciation"; West's "Venus lamenting Adonis" and "The Departure of Regulus"; and the portrait of Lady Molyneux, by Gainsborough.

Such were the beginnings of the Royal Academy, an institution which undoubtedly gave an enormous impetus to English art. If it has never succeeded as a teacher, it has been of immense value as an introducer. To it the artist has owed a larger public, and a more dignified position, than before. From the first it has patronised mediocrity, but still, on the whole, it has rewarded merit. Moreover, it created a

tribunal, however far from a perfect one, yet one administering a sort of justice, and in which, at any rate, artists have had more confidence than in the irresponsible critic and the interested dealer.

Gainsborough.

Gainsborough, as we have said, was not among the list of the original Academicians. But that he deserved that honour more than any man living, except Sir Joshua, no sane person will dispute. He was born in the spring of 1727 at Sudbury, in Suffolk, of a lower middle-class family of Dissenters. His father was a clothier by trade, and Gainsborough, less fortunate than his rival, received an imperfect education at the local grammar school, whence he often played truant. While a mere child he began to paint, and his earliest studies show a hardy attempt to deal directly with Nature.

His Education and Early Life.

At the early age of fourteen he was sent to London, and placed with Gravelot, a clever illustrator of books, from whom he probably got some good. Subsequently, he was at the St. Martin's Lane Academy, and studied under the jovial scene-painter, Hayman, from whom he probably got some harm. His best education was, no doubt, obtained from out-of-door sketching, and in making copies from the Dutch masters, whose work, both in landscape and portraits, had an attraction for him that Reynolds never seemed to have understood. Not finding an opening in London, Gainsborough (then only nineteen) returned to Suffolk, where he married Margaret Burr, a pretty girl with a small fortune. He started in his business at Ipswich, quickly securing the patronage of the neighbouring gentry, painting numerous portraits of their wives and daughters, as well as of their country-houses. About nine years later, on the advice of Mr. Thicknesse, governor of Landguard Fort, he removed to Bath. The way he first attracted Thicknesse's attention has a curiously boyish air. Seeing a dejected face looking over the wall of a friend's garden, he was told that the poor fellow had been standing there all day, and was much impressed on discovering that the "poor fellow" was an effigy painted by Gainsborough. At Bath Gainsborough's success was immediate and complete, and he soon was able to raise his terms to forty and one hundred guineas for half- and full-lengths, obviously remark-

Migrates to Bath.

able prices for a provincial artist. In 1761 he exhibited in London for the first time. This was at the exhibition held in the rooms of the Society of Arts, and the portrait has been identified as that of Earl Nugent. Between that year and 1768 he executed fifteen portraits—including those of Lady Grosvenor and the Duke of Argyll, of General Honywood on his horse, with a background of forest foliage, and of the actors Quin and Garrick, this last characterised by Mrs. Garrick as "the best portrait ever painted of my Davy."

Exhibits in London.

From the foundation of the Academy Gainsborough was a regular contributor of pictures to the exhibitions, including a few—though, under the circumstances, curiously few—landscapes. During his residence in the country his pictures were conveyed by a carrier, Wiltshire, who refused to take money for this service, and in consequence was paid in a coinage which he appreciated far more than gold—viz. in Gainsboroughs. But in 1774 the painter returned to London, and set up his studio at Schomberg House in Pall Mall. There seems, at all times, to have been considerable rivalry between Gainsborough and the other academicians. He had protested, in 1772, against what he considered their unfair manner of hanging his pictures, and during the next two years had exhibited nothing. Nevertheless, in December, 1774, he was elected on the council, probably on his coming to reside in town, and actually received a vote for the presidency. But, absorbed in his art and in his violin—for he was a gifted and passionate musician—he never attended a single meeting. This gave, as might be expected, considerable umbrage to his colleagues on the council, and a motion was made to omit his name from their lists; but it was, however, dropped, and he recommenced the despatch of pictures to the exhibition.

Gainsborough and the Academy.

Later a more serious quarrel arose. Gainsborough had requested that his portraits of the three princesses (the Princess Royal, the Princess Augusta, and the Princess Elizabeth), which had been expressly painted to fill certain panels in a room in Carlton Palace, might be hung at the panel height in the exhibition. This reasonable request was contemptuously ignored on the trivial pretext that the

Academy rule was to hang portraits on the portrait line. Naturally the artist was offended. He withdrew the pictures before the exhibition opened, and never again sent a picture for exhibition. This was in 1784, and he had then been practising his art in London for ten years. They were halcyon years for the painter; the quantity of his work was wonderful, and the quality of his sitters no less so. But all through his life, in the time of fortune as in the time of obscurity, he continued faithful to his love of landscape. Though pecuniarily they were unremunerative, every year he painted one or more landscapes—in 1780 the number was six. But purchasers were so scarce that the walls of the passage from his painting room were covered with them. Even a masterpiece like "The Woodman in the Storm," highly praised as it was by contemporary critics, was unable to find a purchaser at a hundred guineas.

It is, of course, in meagre notes like these, impossible to discuss even a small proportion of Gainsborough's masterpieces. One, however, must be particularly mentioned, than which none has excited more admiration or been the theme of more animated controversy. This is the portrait of Master Buttall, commonly known as "The Blue Boy." It is supposed, and there is a good deal to be said for the hypothesis, that it was painted for the express purpose of refuting one of Sir Joshua's theories It is the one set forth in the eighth of those "discourses" delivered to the students, which positively teem with illuminative thoughts, and yet, when they formulate canons of art or criticism, seem to go strangely wide of the mark. The passage is as follows:—

The "Blue Boy."

"It ought, in my opinion, to be indispensably observed that the masses of light in a picture be always of a warm, mellow colour, yellow, red, or a yellowish white; and that the blue, the grey, or the green colours be kept almost entirely out of these masses, and be used only to support and set off these warm colours."

The date usually assigned to the picture is 1779, soon after the delivery of the lecture, but it has been suggested that it was exhibited at the Academy in 1770, as the portrait of a young gentleman of which Mary Moser wrote that in it Gainsborough "is beyond himself." Hence the suggestion that it was Reynolds who desired to depreciate Gainsborough's

method; but this slightly spiteful proceeding is quite unlike Reynolds, and, in view of the success of the picture, it would have been more than slightly futile. The relation between the picture and the passage is certainly remarkable; but, if exhibited in 1770, Reynolds might easily have forgotten all about it in 1778. Nor would this really be so very surprising, for undoubtedly when he wrote the passage he had forgotten (so full was he of the memories of the Venetian gold) that masses of just such blue are to be found in Vandyck and other great masters of silvery effects. The picture itself is a portrait of a pretty, dark-haired, dark-eyed boy, modishly dressed in a satin jacket, silk stockings with ribbon knots at the knees, and rosettes on his shoes. With the exception of the collarette, which is of white muslin, and the slashings of the sleeves, the whole picture is of the shade known as royal blue. But (as an admirable critic admirably puts it) how shall we give an idea of the harmony of the picture?

"How can we convey to the reader, with any accuracy, its delicacies, the reflections, the high lights, the bright bits of colour, and the soft, warm, deep shades which, blending together, reduce and modify the intensity of the full colour! How can we show the variety of expedients by which the master has managed his shadows, causing the young figure to stand out from a background of autumnal foliage of russet and green tints, and from a powerful sky full of breeze and movement! One must see and admire the picture, and carry away from it the impression made by a masterpiece. Still, if we really wish to gain some conception of this marvellous work, we are tempted, in spite of the vagueness and perhaps puerility of the idea, to strive to recall the happiest reminiscences of Watteau and Van Dyck—the boldness and perfect grace of Watteau, and the severe elegance of Van Dyck."

Characteristics of his Art.

Gainsborough, unlike his great rivals, Reynolds, Wilson, Romney, never, so far as we know, left England—never, certainly, studied in Italy, at the feet of the early fathers of art. No really great painter ever had less training, but if in any case the want can be supplied by genius, it was so in the case of Gainsborough. Of course, he was influenced by the works of others, though not, we think, to any large extent, except by the half-English Vandyck. Thus it is that we find him absolutely the most independent of masters, not only in conception, but in execution. As a draughtsman he is occasionally at fault, as a colourist never, and the *chic* (to

use the modern term) with which he paints such things as powdered hair and caps and ruffles (in which Sir Joshua followed him from afar) is simply marvellous. "Gainsborough's power of colour," says Mr. Ruskin in "Modern Painters," "is capable of taking rank beside that of Rubens. He is the finest colourist, Sir Joshua himself not excluded, of the whole English school." And this is not only Gainsborough, the painter of Mrs. Graham and "the divine duchess," of Mrs. Fitzherbert and Mrs. Siddons, but of the "Cottage Girl" and "The Watering Place," and "The Harvest Waggon," and scores of other noble landscapes of his which are scattered about England. Even in some of his early pictures, painted obviously under Dutch influence, the same feeling for colour is observable.

Reynolds once, at an Academy banquet, referred to Gainsborough as "our best landscape painter," to which Richard Wilson replied, not unadroitly, "and our best portrait painter also." But, in truth, modern English landscape was initiated by Gainsborough. He found that the homesteads and churches of Wessex and of East Anglia, their woods and lanes and rivulets, were fuller of material for the painter than the glorious waste of the Campagna and the ruins of Roman villas and aqueducts. His landscape admits no sham nymphs and Roman ladies in classical attire; his rustics are true children of the soil, and their rags are real rags, however simply picturesque. So, too, of the general form of his tree groups, of his shadowy lanes and woods. They are beautiful because selected with the unerring eye of a man powerfully moved by the feeling for natural beauty. Yet, admirable as the massed trees are, in matter of foliage they are not more realistic than Wilson's. He is quite as indifferent to the delicate distinctions of elm and beech and oak, and the weeds and grasses of the foregrounds belong often to a non-existent flora. Nothing can well be more misleading than to say of him, as Sir Joshua Reynolds did, that it is difficult to determine whether Gainsborough's portraits are most admirable for exact truth of resemblance, or his landscapes for a portrait-like representation of nature. His charm in each is something quite different. He gives us more of beauty in each, more of nature in each, than a photographically

His Landscapes.

exact rendering could possibly do. And thus it is that his landscape art, notwithstanding its obvious limitations, appeals to the most cursory observer, and his pictures seem bits of a real country-side, and redolent with the charm of country life. The great service that Gainsborough did for the art of his country was in finally emancipating it from the old conventions. He "gave himself up wholly to nature," and resolutely cast aside all that came between him and her, and she rewarded her worshipper in the sight of all men.

His Influence.

Gainsborough's tale of work must have been immense, for he painted hard for forty-three years, and was as swift a worker, perhaps swifter when he pleased, than his great rival, but was far more careless of his pictures, many of which have disappeared. On the other hand, where the canvases have survived, they have not generally suffered much deterioration. He was still in the plenitude of his powers when, in 1788, he was carried off by a rapid cancerous affection. Reynolds, from whom, since the quarrel with the Academy, Gainsborough had been more or less estranged, was sent for to the bedside of his great rival. Bending over the dying man, he caught almost his last words. They were words of peace and good-will: "We are all going to heaven, and Vandyck is of the party." So ended Thomas Gainsborough, the kind-hearted, emotional painter-musician—the great lover of beauty, the sensitive colourist, the man of instinct, the born artist to the tips of his fingers. His rival Reynolds, the man of observation and intelligence, the great master of character—and principally of virile and stately character, though his sympathy with child-life was unequalled—survived him but four years. The third of the great triumvirate lived fourteen years longer.

This man, George Romney, remains to be spoken of. Let it be said at once, his was a lower and more animal temperament—a less perfect, a less conscientious artist, more susceptible to the commoner delights of pretty things, and so, perhaps, he comes to be the most engagingly human, and the most sympathetic of them all. He was born at Beckside, near Dalton-in-Furness, Lancashire, in 1734, of quite humble parents. His father was one of the peasant proprietors, who in the neighbouring

Romney.

counties are known as statesmen, and practised the trade of a joiner; he was an ingenious man—a sort of Jack of all trades, known among his neighbours as honest John Rumney (for this was the original spelling of the name), but he was naturally without the rudiments of education. George Romney was, in respect of opportunities, thus immensely worse off than Reynolds, the son of a poor clergyman, or Gainsborough, the son of a well-to-do tradesman. The neighbourhood of Romney's home is picturesque, and he lived in the sight of the mountains; but this was almost his sole advantage, for he was brought up amongst unlettered agriculturists and artisans, whose ideas of art were limited to the red lions and green dragons that swung over public-house doors. All the education that he ever received was obtained before he was twelve years old, at a school kept by a clergyman named Fell, who instructed bucolic youths for the modest honorarium of five shillings per quarter. His father, however, thought the expenditure excessive, or at least unremunerative, and removed him to the carpenter's bench. There he worked at joinery, and did a little simple carving, obtaining, indeed, some reputation for his rustic fiddles. But his passion for drawing, and a chance portrait that excited the admiration of a neighbour, induced his father to apprentice him, at the age of nineteen, to an artist named Steele. The man was a dissolute fellow, who boasted of having been a pupil of Vanloo's at Paris, and whose Frenchified ways gained for him the contemptuous nickname of "Count" Steele. This mediocre practitioner was Romney's first and only master, but, perhaps fortunately, did not teach him much.

Early Life and Training.

While Romney was in Steele's service he fell ill, and was tenderly nursed by a housemaid named Mary Abbot, whom on his recovery he married. He was then twenty-one. Steele wandered away to York, taking his apprentice with him; and the removal was so far fortunate that it led to some of Romney's drawings coming under the notice of the neighbouring Vicar of Sutton, who was no other than the Rev. Laurence Sterne. At York, too, he bought a few prints of Dutch masters, which at his leisure he copied in oils. At the close of his apprenticeship he went to Kendal, not far from his old home, and there eked out a living by portrait

painting and by raffling his copies of old Dutch pictures. At length he saved enough to take him to London, for which he departed in 1762, leaving some two-thirds of his savings with his wife. It does not seem that there was in this any premeditated desertion, as has been suggested, the painter's object being simply to seek a better opening for his talents. In London he first obtained notice for his historical subjects, such as the "Death of General Wolfe," which was awarded a first prize at the Society of Arts exhibition, though the award was annulled at the instigation, as Romney believed, of Sir John (then Mr.) Reynolds. He was subsequently more successful in these historical compositions, and his own desire was to shine as an historical painter, but, fortunately for us all, the popular demand obliged him, in spite of himself, to become the third portrait painter of England. His financial success was, however, sufficient to put him in a position to defray the expenses of a journey to Paris, where he had a cordial welcome from Joseph Vernet, then engaged on a commission from Louis XV. to paint the great seaports of France. Returning to London he continued his work, and subsequently revisited his family at the north. It was in this epoch, some two years before the foundation of the Royal Academy, that he made the acquaintance of Richard Cumberland, who sat to him, and whose enthusiastic admiration proved of high service to the painter in his lifetime, and did something for his posthumous fame. The picture that Cumberland drew of Romney with his pen shows admirable insight, and resembles one of those masterly sketches for which the painter's brush is famed. "Romney," he says,

Removal to London.

"Shy, private, studious and contemplative, conscious of all the disadvantages of a stinted education, of a habit naturally hypochondriac, with aspen nerves that every breath could ruffle, was at once in art the rival, and in nature the very contrast of Sir Joshua. A man of few wants, strict economy, and with no dislike to money, he had opportunities enough to enrich him even to satiety; but he was at once so eager to begin and so slow to finish his portraits, that he was for ever disappointed of receiving payments for them by the casualties and revolutions in the families they were designed for. So many of his sitters were killed off, so many favourite ladies were dismissed, so many fond wives divorced before he could bestow half an hour's pains upon their petticoats, that his

unsaleable stock was immense; whilst with a little more regularity and decision he would have more than doubled his fortune, and escaped an infinity of petty troubles that disturbed the temper."

In 1776, shortly after his meeting with Cumberland, he removed to Newport Street, then quite a fashionable quarter for artists, where he painted Mrs. Yates as "The Tragic Muse," and rapidly acquired considerable vogue. The cause of his exclusion from the Academy remains something of a mystery, for his membership of the Society of Artists was an easily removable disqualification. It was probably due most of all to the fact that he was a poor, unlettered man, and at that date unfit either for literary or quasi-fashionable society—a kind of disqualification which has at all times had no inconsiderable weight in academical counsels. Still, he had great success with the outside world; but conscious, in the midst of his success, of the deficiencies of his training, he threw up his studio and went to Italy with the miniature-painter Ozias Humphrey. He made serious and prolonged studies in the Vatican, and afterwards at Parma, besides drawing much from the nude model. His studies left a lasting impression on his manner, and if they are responsible for his perhaps too persistent passion for a sort of classical drapery, the drapery of the sculptor rather than of the painter, he owed to them no small share of the simplicity and dignity which, added to an intimate and vivid personal grace peculiarly his own, make up his almost indescribable charm. Probably, too, as one of his biographers has put it, these studies enabled him to avoid the snare of affectation into which even his greater rivals not infrequently fell.

After his return to England his practice increased rapidly, and he took the house in Cavendish Square formerly tenanted by Cotes, the *pastelliste*. Reynolds's dislike for "the man in Cavendish Square," as he called him, has never been quite explained, but it is greatly to Romney's credit that he never disparaged his rival, and always replied to the detractors of Reynolds—"He is the greatest painter that ever lived. I see in his pictures an exquisite charm that I see in nature, but in no other pictures." This—from the painter of Mrs. Anne Carwardine and her child, of the Sempstress, of the Reading Girl Serena, of Miss Cumberland, of Mrs. Stables and her daughters, of Lady Milner, and of Admiral Yorke as a boy—

was, at least, praise worth treasuring. It is really by such works as these that Romney should be judged, by these and by the brilliant sketches which he left unfinished, rather than by his more ambitious historical subjects, or even the splendid figures painted while he was under the enchantment of that incarnation of healthy animal beauty, Emma Lady Hamilton.

Connection with Lady Hamilton.

Romney's connection with that famous lady has been probably misinterpreted. Certain it is that many pictures of his have been dubbed "Lady Hamilton" which were painted before the painter had seen her, and all sorts of fables have been attached to others that were really taken from this sumptuous model. Their meeting did not occur till the summer of 1782, when Charles Greville (whose mistress she was) brought her to his studio. As far as Romney is concerned, her conduct was unquestionably correct; but Romney, who was always a little mad, then and there became infatuated with her beauty. Painting from "the divine lady," as he called her, thenceforward became his chief delight. Under the influence of this veritable passion, he poured forth, besides studies innumerable, a whole series of demi-goddesses and saints and heroines, Cassandras and Circes and Magdalens. Much as Romney's fame owes to this connection, it was probably, on the whole, unfortunate for Romney's development, except so far as it prevented his giving way to the desire, which in later years grew on him, to paint great original subjects at the prompting of his friend and flatterer, the poet Hayley. Painting from Lady Hamilton, or working up old studies of her ladyship, together with a great production of portraits, kept him from carrying out what he called "my system of original subjects, moral, and my own, and one of the grandest that has been thought of," which could hardly have added to his fame. He had long since abandoned all notion of returning to his family. In thirty-seven years he only paid his wife two visits, and it was only in 1799 that, miserable and broken in mind and body, he returned to the uncomplaining woman who had been the nurse of the obscure apprentice of Christopher Steele, and who was now to be the nurse of the greatest living painter in England, when, for three years, he lay paralysed and dying in the home he had so long neglected.

Romney's Place in Art History.

It is exceedingly difficult to appraise at its right value the merit of Romney. His popularity in his lifetime was no doubt helped by the sort of revival of neoclassicism which took place at the end of the century; but, on the other hand, he never enjoyed any share of Court favour; he was antagonistic to the Royal Academy and he disliked the company of his brother artists, and was repaid in kind, yet Northcote, the pupil of Reynolds, allows that his master was "not much employed as a portrait painter after Romney grew into fashion." This is all the more amazing when we remember that Romney had no decent training, either of mind or hand, and that he was entirely ignorant of anatomy. "Could art come by impulse," says an academician, writing of Romney, "he would have been a great artist." We are inclined to think that it did so come in his case, and that he was a great artist. It is, nevertheless, true that the lack of other things besides the divine afflatus made him an unfinished artist, solid as some of his work seems, and prevented his influencing for good the generation that succeeded him.

Character.

Romney's character has been, as a rule, harshly dealt with. His conduct to his wife is, no doubt, inexcusable; but his relations with his family, notwithstanding his long separation, remained affectionate to the end. He expended his savings on his brother's outfit to India. His children revered his memory. His wife never complained. In later life, as the insidious disease of which he died gained ground, his natural moodiness and eccentricity increased, but his friendship with men like Cumberland, Cowper the poet, Flaxman, and Adam Walker, and even Hayley, shows that he must have possessed some endearing qualities. Flaxman, whom he had helped and encouraged as a boy, describes a visit paid to Eartham, Hayley's country house, spent in Romney's company, as follows:—"I had the happiness of living such a fortnight as many thousands of my fellow creatures go out of the world without enjoying." And after the painter's death he wrote:—"In my long attachment to Romney I have felt the powerful charm that attaches a reader of feeling to the Hamlet of Shakespeare." The comparison is singularly felicitous, for in Romney, too, we have the strange brilliancy, the incompleteness, the lack

of courage, the moodiness, the indefinable charm, and over all the shadow of madness and an unhonoured grave. The Hamlet among artists—that is Romney.

THE introduction of the field cultivation of turnips and artificial grasses proved the pivots of agricultural improvements. The new system of alternate husbandry proved that farming in a circle was a more productive process than the similar method in argument. More stock meant more manure; more manure fertilised and enriched the soil, and trebled its yield; larger crops supplied the means of supporting still larger flocks and herds. Thus the agricultural circle seemed to be capable of indefinite expansion, and those who followed the practices of Tull and Townshend realised fortunes.

R. E. PROTHERO. Agriculture.

Improvements in Tillage.

But before the full value of the recent improvements could be realised, it was necessary that the live-stock should be also improved. A revolution in stock-breeding was required. The changes in the grazier's art, which were introduced by Bakewell, a farmer of Dishley, near Loughborough, in Leicestershire, produced results even more remarkable than those which flowed from the new farming practices of Tull and Townshend. These changes form the most striking feature in the agricultural history of the period under review.

The Improvement in Cattle-Breeding.

Up to the middle of the eighteenth century wool had been the chief source of profit to English farmers. Other forms of agricultural produce were raised for home consumption rather than for sale. England was, in the main, still a pasture country; the British farmer took his seat on the wool-sack; the fleece was golden; the carcase of the sheep was of little value. As wool-producing animals sheep had been studied, and they were classified as long-woolled, short-woolled, and intermediate. Wool was used either for combing, that is, for stuffs and stockings; or for carding, that is, for coarse and fine cloth. Judged by this standard, the small, white-faced, hornless Ryeland or Hereford sheep were the most profitable, because their fleeces were of peculiar

The Old Standards of Merit.

fineness, and Leominster wool commanded the highest prices, while Cotswold wool stood next in the market. If any care was ever shown by individual breeders in the selection of rams and ewes, the choice was determined by consideration for the fleece or by fanciful points which possessed no practical value, such as the colour of the face, the shape of the horn, or the blackness of the legs.

In cattle, again, no true standard of shape was recognised. The qualities for which cattle were valued were not their fattening propensities or their early maturity, but their milking capacity and their power of draught. No attention, except in the north-western counties, as Hartlib allows, was paid to breed. Height was the principal object aimed at. The gaunt Holderness breed was, from this point of view, highly esteemed. "The goodnesse of the soile," says Lawson in his *New Orchard* (1626), "in Howl-, or Hollow-, derness, in Yorkshire, is well knowne to all that know the River Humber and the huge bulkes of their cattle there." "Cattle, wrote Culley in 1809, "were more like ill-made black horses than an ox or a cow. Nothing would please but elephants or giants." Parish bulls were selected only for those qualities in which Obadiah's pet, so strenuously defended by Mr. Shandy, was alleged to be wanting. It was a promiscuous union of nobody's son with everybody's daughter. To country squires, in the reigns of the first two Georges, the standard of excellence was probably that of the famous "Lincolnshire ox," exhibited, as the advertisement sets out, "with great satisfaction at the University of Cambridge" in the reign of Queen Anne. He was "Nineteen Hands High, and Four Yards Long from his Face to his Rump. The like Beast for Bigness was never seen in the World before. *Vivat Reginæ*" (*sic*).

When prizes were offered for the longest legs, it is not surprising that all over the country were scattered tall, raw-boned, wall-sided cattle, and lean, leggy, unthrifty sheep. It must not, however, be supposed that our ancestors were unwise in their generation. Legs were of value when miry lanes had to be traversed, and animals roamed for miles in search of food. Size of bone stood the ox in good stead when it dragged the plough through stiff clays. But a time was rapidly approaching when beef and mutton would be of more

value than power of draught or fineness of wool. Bakewell was the agricultural opportunist who saw the impending change, and knew how to meet it. He provided meat for the million, and, by so doing, contributed as much to the wealth of the country as Arkwright or Watt. Many monuments have been raised in Westminster Abbey to the memory of men who less deserved the honour than the Leicestershire farmer.

Bakewell.

Born in 1725, he was barely twenty when he began his experiments in stock-breeding. When Arthur Young, armed with an introduction from the Marquis of Rockingham, visited him in 1760, he resembled in appearance the typical British yeoman who figures on jugs of Staffordshire pottery—"a tall, broad-shouldered, stout man of brown-red complexion, clad in a loose brown coat, scarlet waistcoat, leather breeches, and top-boots." Visitors assembled from all parts of the world to see his farm, his water-canals, his irrigated meadows on which mowers were employed from May to Christmas, his famous black cart-stallion, his bull "Twopenny," and his ram "Two-pounder," or to gather from his lips the principles which are now the axioms of stock-breeding. There were, however, many secrets of his business which he jealously guarded from everyone but the old shepherd to whom they were confided, and it is said that he never sold a sheep to a butcher which he had not previously infected with the rot, lest it should be used for breeding purposes. In his kitchen he entertained "Russian princes, French and German royal dukes, British peers, and sightseers of every degree." Yet he never altered the routine of his daily life. "Breakfast at eight; dinner at one; supper at nine; bed at eleven o'clock; at half-past ten, let who would be there, he knocked out his last pipe." So lavish was his hospitality that, though large sums of money passed through his hands, he died in poverty.

When Bakewell began his stock-breeding experiments, he selected his sheep from the best animals in the neighbourhood, and a guinea, or even half a guinea, procured his choice from the fold. The breed of sheep that he formed was, it is supposed, based upon the old Leicestershire or Warwickshire sheep crossed with the Ryeland. Marshall, writing at the close of the century, thus describes the genuine Warwickshire ram in his unimproved

His Sheep.

state:—"His frame large and loose; his bones heavy; his legs long and thick; his chine, as well as his rump, as sharp as a hatchet; his skin rattling on his ribs like a skeleton covered with parchment." The material sounds unpromising. But Bakewell had a well-defined object before him, and he had discovered for himself the principle of selection and the secret of breeding "in and in." He used only those rams and ewes which possessed the points and qualities that he wished to reproduce. His object was to breed animals which weighed most in the best joints, and most quickly repaid the cost of the food that they consumed. "Small in size and great in value," or the Holkham toast of "Symmetry well covered," was the motto of his experiments. He saw that the value of the sheep lay not in the length of its legs, but in the size of the barrel, that the bones must be fine, the form compact, and that the true shape for profit was "a firkin on as short legs as possible." As by judicious selection the form, fattening propensities, and early maturity were perpetuated, the breed was established, and Bakewell's "New Leicesters" for a time swept all competitors before them. They were the first breed of sheep which were scientifically treated in England, and, though they were less adapted for the Eastern and Southern counties than other native breeds, they were unrivalled in their own Midland districts.

In 1755 Bakewell had let his rams at 16s. each for the season. In 1789, some six years before his death, a society, formed to extend his breed of sheep, hired his rams for a single season for 6,000 guineas. The reclamation of commons and the general adoption of roots and grasses have something to say to the change; but some idea of the effect which Bakewell helped to produce in the art of the grazier may be gathered from a comparison of the weight of sheep and cattle sold in Smithfield Market in 1710 and 1795. In the former year, the average weight was, for beeves, 370 lbs.; calves, 50 lbs.; sheep, 28 lbs.; lambs, 18 lbs. In the latter year the average weights were respectively 800 lbs., 148 lbs., 80 lbs., and 50 lbs.

His Cattle-Breeding.

Bakewell also turned his attention to cattle-breeding. But here he was less successful. It was his material, and not his principles, that failed. His Leicester Long-horns, based upon the Craven Long-horns, proved to be good milkers, but nothing

more. It was, however, by his example that other breeds, with better natural qualities, were improved. The Teeswaters, or Durham Shorthorns, of Charles Colling, both for the dairy and the butcher, were to cattle-breeders what Bakewell's New Leicesters were to sheep-farmers. All over the country men followed in his footsteps, adopted his practices, emulated his standard. The formation of flocks and herds became a favourite pastime of the wealthy, and a profitable pursuit for farmers. If Flora MacIvor had not pre-deceased Bakewell, she might have lived to see the day when country gentlemen might be breeders of cattle without being "boorish two-legged steers like Killancurit." As the New Leicesters had been improved till they held the rich plains against all comers, so the Southdowns for the hills and the Cheviots for the mountains were improved by breeders who followed the example of Bakewell. As the pioneer of stock-breeding, the Leicestershire farmer may be considered, in a sense, the creator of the Southdowns of Ellman of Glynde, or Jonas Webb of Babraham, of the Ketton herd of Colling, the Herefords of Tomkins, or the Devons of Lord Leicester and Mr. Quartly, which, within the next fifty years, were brought to a high pitch of perfection.

G. TOWNSEND WARNER. Manufacture.

Mention has been made (p. 113) of the fact that it took a number of spinners to keep one weaver in full work, and there is evidence to show that the handloom weavers of the first half of the eighteenth century did not, as a class, work very hard. Their work was, in fact, as a rule remunerative enough to allow them at least one day's holiday a week. Masters of the day, who put work out among the handloom weavers, supplying the yarn and finding a market for the goods when complete, make complaints of the uncertainty of getting work done to time, and it is further clear that one thing much regretted by the handloom weavers, when the day of factories came, was the loss of liberty. It was not altogether that they were compelled to work more; but they could no longer work when it suited them, and leave off when they pleased. Although it was generally more difficult

Textile Industries: Spinning and Weaving.

for a weaver to find yarn than work, the conditions of the two industries were, in 1730, fairly in equilibrium. It is evident that if either there was a much greater supply of yarn than could be made up into cloth, or, on the other hand, if weavers could weave yarn much faster than spinners could spin it, there would be a tendency to try and drive the lagging trade, to improve it so that it could keep pace with the other. This is exactly what happened in the textile trades. First, an improvement in weaving gave the handloom a lead. There was a market for cloth; weavers were ready to work, but the supply of yarn, always rather scanty, became quite inadequate. A weaver might have to walk three or four miles in a morning and call on five or six spinners before he could collect sufficient yarn for weft to serve him for the rest of the day. Wits were set to work, and machines were made to spin. These brought up the spinning trade. Yarn was put on the market far cheaper and better than before. So great was the supply that the handloom could not do the required work. Again the spur to invention was applied. If machines could be made to spin, why should they not be made to weave? Accordingly, before long the power-loom was designed, and this enabled weaving to catch up the twin industry that had left it temporarily behind.

Progress of two Interdependent Arts.

Machinery called for power. Water-power would do where it could be obtained, but it was not to be had everywhere; wind was altogether too fickle and feeble, horses too expensive; and so came the demand for a power that would work anywhere, and at a cost that left a margin for profit. A premium thus put on the improvement of the old atmospheric engine produced the steam engine, by which industry was finally collected from the villages where the handloom weavers had lived, and from the banks of the streams of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the first mills had been built, and settled in the towns. I do not wish to imply that the progress of the industrial revolution, the sequence of invention, was quite so regular and plain as it has been here sketched. But the outlines of the picture are true. The one impetus was given; and, that done, the invention spread from one process and one trade to

Power.

others, taking, as it were, larger and larger strides as it went on its way.

The first in the series of inventors was John Kay, of Bury. He was first engaged in a woollen factory at Colchester, but in 1730 set up at Bury as a reedmaker. His first patent for twisting and carding mohair and twining and dressing thread did not come to much. But in 1733 he took out a patent for the fly shuttle. The shuttle which carries the weft had hitherto been passed from one hand of the weaver to the other on its way through the warp. This was at best a slow process, and made it impossible for a weaver to weave anything but narrow widths. In fact, the commonest width of woven cloths is still three-quarters of a yard, a length fixed by the necessity of passing the shuttle from hand to hand. For wide goods two men were required, who sent the shuttle from one to the other. The essence of Kay's invention was that the shuttle was thrown from side to side along the race-board by a mechanical device instead of being passed from hand to hand. One hand of the weaver only was required for the shuttle, while the other was left free to beat up the cloth after each throw, and the shuttle would fly across wide cloth as readily as narrow. This invention doubled the weaver's power of work in addition to improving the quality of the work done. Kay's invention was patented, but he was not successful in keeping it to himself. The fly shuttle soon became widely used, and the demand for yarn became greater than ever. Kay himself tried his hand at machine spinning, but he was not successful. Nor, indeed, was he the first in the field, for in 1738 Lewis Paul had patented a machine for spinning by a novel method. The method consisted in employing two rollers, the second roller going slightly the faster of the two, and stretching the sliver as it was delivered off the first one. Paul was associated with John Wyatt, of Birmingham, and it is held by some that Wyatt was the real inventor. He himself said so, and his son claimed to possess the father's original model made in 1733. Probably Wyatt was only employed to make Paul's machinery; but anyhow, they anticipated Arkwright in the principle of spinning by rollers. But whereas Arkwright made his machine a practical success,

Invention: Kay's Flying Shuttle.

Paul and Wyatt: Roller-Spinning.

Paul and Wyatt did not. Their machine was not altogether a failure: ninety skeins a day was done by each frame, but the projectors did not find business enough to keep four frames out of five going. And so the problem of supplying yarn satisfactorily still remained unsolved. It is worth notice, however, that Paul was also the first to give to the world the plan of a circular or continuous carding engine. Thus, though he achieved no commercial success, he hit on two suggestions which were developed later into important inventions.

Hargreaves's Jenny.

In 1764, however, a handloom weaver named James Hargreaves, of Blackburn, got an idea from a spinning wheel, which, accidentally overturned on the floor, continued to revolve, the thread still remaining in the hand of the spinner. This idea was developed into the spinning jenny, a machine which, as he first made it, worked eight rovings in a row: that is, he multiplied by eight the power of the hand-spinner; and even more than this, for Hargreaves's jenny was a machine that could be worked by children. The jenny had no drawing rollers; the roving was clutched between two bars, which were slowly drawn away from the spindle, while the spindle put in the twist. The machine was, of course, worked by hand, but it was found that Hargreaves's original number of eight spindles could be easily increased. In fact, so many as one hundred could be placed on one machine. Hargreaves used the jenny for himself, but afterwards sold some. Thereon the spinners, who feared that the new machine would throw them out of employment, broke into Hargreaves's house and destroyed the machine. Hargreaves migrated to Nottingham, and there took out a patent and set up a cotton mill; but when he came into litigation his patent was held invalid on account of his previous sale of the machines. Hargreaves died in 1778, without having gained much profit from his invention. But this was not because the machine was a failure. It is true that it did not at first oust the hand-spinners in cotton; but it gradually made its way, first in the cotton and then in woollen industry, so much so that by the date of the inventor's death there were at work in England 20,000 hand jennies of eighty spindles each.

Hargreaves had overcome one industrial difficulty. He had improved the supply of weft, and had enabled the spinner to keep pace with the weaver. But there was another thing he had not done. It has been already explained that the description "cottons," as applied to the goods of this time, was only partly true. The yarn of the day was not strong enough to be used for the warp, which was accordingly made of linen thread, and cotton used for the weft only. Thus the cotton goods of the beginning of the reign of George III. were composite material, half linen, half cotton. Much, then, was to be gained if cotton could be made fine and at the same time strong. This improvement was the work of Arkwright and Crompton. Richard Arkwright, a native of Preston, began life as a barber. He was a man of vigorous intellect and quick observation, and though not professionally connected with textile industries, his mind was too receptive to allow him to remain uninterested in what was going on around him. There is no proof that he had heard of Paul's invention when he first began, but the principle he used was the same. With the aid of a clockmaker—Kay, of Warrington—he made a model which gave him hope of success. He then applied to a capitalist, Atherton, who offered him the help of a smith and a watch-tool maker. The first machine of the kind, which afterwards received the name of "Waterframe" from the fact that it was worked by water-power, was made in the parlour of a house belonging to the Free Grammar School of Preston. But with the fate of Kay and Hargreaves before him, Arkwright had no mind to stay in Lancashire, and he accordingly went to Nottingham.

Arkwright's Frame.

The principle of Arkwright's spinning frame consisted in spinning by rollers revolving at a different velocity. His machine contained four pairs of rollers, driven by wheel and pinion. In each pair the top roller was coated with leather to enable it to catch hold of the cotton, and the lower one fluted longitudinally. One pair of rollers revolving more quickly than the other, the roving was drawn to the requisite fineness and firmness for twisting, which was accomplished by spindles or flyers in front of the rollers. The yarn thus produced, known as "water-twist," owing to the fact that it was made by the "water-frame," was harder and firmer than any produced

before. Arkwright pointed out that it was especially suited for warp. In fact, warp is now almost always made of "throstle-spun" yarn (on Arkwright's plan), while the "mule-spun" (Crompton's) is used for weft only. For some time, however, manufacturers were shy of using it. It was first used for stockings, an industry which had its home round Nottingham; in 1773 it was employed for warp in calicoes in place of the old-fashioned linen warp. This, curiously enough, brought it under an Act of Parliament; for Parliament, under the idea that all goods consisting of pure cotton must be Indian, had passed in 1736 an Act to protect British manufacture, placing all such under a double duty. The Act was repealed in 1774, and in 1775 Arkwright took out a series of patents by which the whole process of manufacture of yarn, including carding, drawing, roving and spinning, was carried out by one machine. From working cotton it was later adapted to other industries. Arkwright was no more successful than other inventors in protecting his patent rights. But he was a man of energy and business-like habits, and managed to make a large fortune by the application of his invention, although he could not keep the use of it solely for himself. In complete contrast to the success of Arkwright stands the failure of Samuel Crompton. Shy and retiring, he was as unfitted to battle for himself as could well be imagined. When engaged as a young man, near Bolton, in yarn spinning, he was vexed by the necessity of constantly mending the broken ends of the yarn spun on Hargreaves's jenny. He set about inventing a plan to obviate this. Fear of his neighbours compelled him to work secretly and mostly at night. In 1779 his machine, originally called the "muslin wheel," but afterwards known as the "mule," was complete. It turned out a yarn, superior both in strength and fineness, to Arkwright's water-twist. This was attained by an adaptation of Arkwright's rollers to Hargreaves's jenny (hence the name, "mule") and the addition of something new, namely, the spindle carriage, which prevented undue strain on the thread before completion. It thus drew and twisted a greater length than the jenny had done. The machine reproduced the action of the left finger and thumb of the hand-spinner, as he held and stretched the sliver while

Crompton's Mule.

the spindle twisted it into yarn. Crompton's yarn when sold attracted the notice of Bolton masters. The inventor was plagued and pestered for his secret, and unable to keep it to himself, and fearing mob violence, he gave it up in return for promises of a subscription, which, when collected, realised the magnificent sum of £67 6s. 6d. This generosity, were it not pathetic, would be ridiculous; anyhow, it was too much for the unfortunate Crompton, who, soured by failure, turned into a misanthrope, destroying his machines and refusing all offers of assistance. He was naturally not consoled in his sullen retirement by the knowledge that his invention had started a flourishing muslin industry in which large fortunes were made.

The net result of these inventions was to place the spinning business far in front of the weaver in point of productiveness. Hargreaves's, Arkwright's, and Crompton's work had far outweighed Kay's invention. And although it was in the cotton trade that the improvements were first made, they were of a kind that could be applied by degrees to the woollen trade. Consequently, the weaver had his hands full, and spinners had sometimes difficulty in getting their produce off, and the old hand-spinners, beaten both in quantity and quality, found their trade beginning to slip from them. The story of how the weavers again, as it were, caught up the spinners will find a place in the next chapter.

The steady retrogression of iron smelting in England is shown by the quantity of iron imported. The amount rose steadily. From 1711-1718 the yearly average was 15,642 tons; from 1729-1735, 25,501 tons; from 1750-1755, 34,072 tons; from 1761-1766, 48,980 tons. The reason has been already mentioned, namely, the scarcity of charcoal. The Darbys, father and son, had shown that coke could be used to replace charcoal, and the story of the recovery of the iron trade is mainly the story of the spread of this knowledge. The difficulty with coke was to get an effective blast. The trompe, a water-blast used in the Catalan charcoal forge, was not of sufficient power. The earliest blowing engines were large bellows worked by horse- or water-power, and so arranged, in sets of two or four, as to give a fairly continuous

Iron: Smelting by Coke.

though not a powerful blast. The water-power, where there was no natural fall, was sometimes supplied by one of the early forms of steam engine (p. 317). The first improvement in the blast was due to Smeaton, who built for Roebuck at the Carron Iron Works, about 1760—a cylinder blowing engine. The power, as was customary, was indirect. The engine furnished water which in its turn drove four blowing cylinders. These were 4 ft. 6 in. in diameter, with tightly-fitted pistons. There was a valve in the bottom opening inwards to admit air as the piston rose; when the piston fell this valve closed and another valve near the bottom opened into a pipe along which the air was driven. The machine was not altogether satisfactory, as there was no effective regulator to keep the blast steady; but the yield of the furnaces rose in consequence from ten or twelve tons per week to forty, and a yearly average of something over 1,500. When it is remembered that the average yield of the charcoal furnaces in England in 1740 was 294 tons, the progress made is evident. More is to be said of the blast, but it must be deferred until some account has been given of Watt and the steam engine. But even the imperfect engine of the type built by Smeaton was more and more used. By 1788 the yield of charcoal pig was 13,100 tons per annum, this being a decrease of 4,250 tons since 1750; while in the same year the twenty-four furnaces using coke yielded 37,000 tons. The charcoal masters affected to disparage the quality of the pig made with coke. Unquestionably the coke-pig was more liable to impurity, and no doubt was sometimes red short (*i.e.* excessively brittle when red hot), from the presence of sulphur. But the coke-pig could be good enough when properly made, for a writer mentions that in 1746 a certain Ford, who was a partner with the Darbys, made iron from ore and coal, both raised in Coalbrookdale, either brittle or tough as he pleased, and soft enough to be used for cannon and bear turning. If this statement is accurate, Ford is entitled to the credit of first using raw-coal (for although Dudley speaks of "pit cole," it is almost certain that he coked his coal before using it). But there is some doubt on the subject. The thing likely to strike a casual observer was not the use of coal as distinct from coke, but

Improved Blast.

Charcoal and Coke.

the use of something that was not charcoal. The second Abraham Darby's charge for his blast furnace was five baskets of coke, two of brays (small coke), one of peat, and then the ore and limestone. The manager of the Coalbrookdale works in 1757 was Reynolds, and in his time raw coal was used, at any rate in part, as the fuel of the blast furnace. It will be necessary to recur to this again in the next chapter. Another important new process was that of casting steel, first discovered by Benjamin Huntsman, of Sheffield. It was believed that the process was complicated, and Huntsman kept his secret for some little time, while imitators tried their best to find it out. The secret was discovered by Walker, of Greenside, a rival founder, who, as the story goes, disguised himself as a tramp and begged to be allowed to sit near the furnace one bitter night for the sake of the warmth. In Huntsman's process the blister steel was broken up and melted in crucibles with lids, the heat being kept on till the steel seemed to boil, and after three hours it could be poured off into moulds in the usual way. A layer of glass was generally put on top of the steel, but this does not seem to have served for anything but to mislead imitators. Huntsman used excellent materials, and his steel was of first-rate quality; although it was not at first popular in Sheffield, it was much used in France, and was found to be so good that Sheffield had to take it up in self-defence. The Carron works gave the name to the carronades, "a piece of carriage ordnance cast for the first time in 1779, at the iron works of the Carron Company. Although shorter than the navy 4-pounder and lighter by a trifle than the navy 12-pounder, this gun equalled in its cylinder the 8-inch howitzer." The boring of these cannon was not very exact, for when cylinders for Watt's engines were bored at Carron by the same machinery, Watt congratulated himself if they were not more than three-eighths of an inch out. John Wilkinson, of Bersham, invented an improved machine for boring cylinders true, and executed many orders from Boulton and Watt.

Carron.

John Wilkinson.

Wilkinson is an interesting figure in the iron trade. He was the first of the great ironmasters. His father was a foreman at Blackbarrow. John and his brother built their

first furnace near the same place to smelt hæmatite; the concern prospered and the brothers had forges at Bersham, Bradley, and Merthyr Tydvil, becoming the largest manufacturers of their day. They cast the whole of the tubes, pipes, cylinders, and ironwork required for the Paris waterworks. John Wilkinson urged the use of iron so strongly and so incessantly that he was thought "iron mad," to talk as he did of iron bridges, iron houses, and iron ships. But he had the pleasure of proving his critics wrong, for he was, with Abraham Darby (the third), principally concerned in recommending the use of iron for the first iron bridge, the Broseley Bridge over the Severn, cast by Darby at Coalbrookdale, and opened in 1779. And in 1790 he made at his own works in South Wales the first iron vessel ever launched. It was used on the Severn. His "iron-madness" hung by him to death, for he had an iron coffin made in readiness, and used to show it and recommend similar ones to his friends. After all this preparation the coffin, oddly enough, turned out to be a misfit, and Wilkinson's body was interred for a time whilst another coffin was cast.

Coal Mining: Difficulties with Water.

The increased demand for coke stimulated coal mining. Between 1700 and 1750 the output of the kingdom rose from 2,612,000 tons to 4,773,828 tons and to 6,424,000 tons in 1780. This increased demand led to the opening in some cases of new mines, but as this is always unremunerative at first, the tendency was to drive the pits deeper and deeper. According to a paper in the *Annual Register* for 1769, the deepest mine in England at the time was a copper mine at Ecton Hill in Staffordshire, the depth of the shaft from the hilltop being more than 400 yards. Access, however, was usually gained by an adit, varying in height from 4ft. to 6ft., to a central platform for landing the ore, whence the descent to where the ore was got was 160 yards, by ladders, lobs, and cross-pieces of timber let into the rock. "In descending from the principal lodgment you pass thirty ladders, some half broken, others not half staved; in some places by half-cut notches or steps in the rock; in others you must almost slide on your breech, and often in imminent danger of tumbling topsy-turvy into the mine." Sixty men worked below, six hours at a shift, for 2d. the hour. The ore was drawn up to

the platform by a man working a winch, and then taken along the adit in waggons holding a ton and a half; these waggons had cast brass wheels, and were run in grooves through the adit by boys from twelve to fourteen years of age. The ore was broken up by men, carried by little boys in hand-barrows to the sorting shed, where it was sorted by little girls, then further broken or bucked by women with hammers, and finally washed in the buddle. The price given for it by the smelting houses was from £7 to £16 per ton; when purified and cast into bars it fetched £70 to £90 the ton. Three hundred men, women, and children were employed, women earning by task-work 4d. to 8d. the day, girls and boys from 2d. to 4d. There was constant employment for both sexes from five to sixty years of age. The owner, the Duke of Devonshire, was believed to clear £8,000 to £10,000 annually by it, and employed there all the labouring poor who came from neighbouring parishes. The mine was surprisingly dry, the daily work of four horses being enough to keep down the water. But increased depth generally meant increasing difficulties with water. Even the tin and copper mines in the hilly districts in Cornwall, which had first of all been drained by the driving of adit levels, now went too deep for such remedies. Pumps and rows of buckets were used, worked either by horse-power or human labour, or, where possible, by water power. To pump out water was the first use made of the early steam engine. It is unnecessary here to relate the whole story of the way in which the properties of steam came to be understood, but it has been thought better to travel somewhat outside the limits of the chapter in date, so as to be able to exhibit as a whole the various steps of improvement which made the steam engine, even before Watt's time, a powerful and useful machine. The first engine that calls for notice was constructed by the Marquis of Worcester about 1650. He used the pressure of steam in a boiler to raise water to a considerable height. Sir Samuel Morland further developed the same idea, and applied it in Charles II.'s reign to waterworks and fountains. Denys Papin familiarised men with high pressures in his "Digester," which was fitted with his own invention—the

Early Steam Engines.

Worcester.

Papin.

lever safety valve. He also used steam to create a vacuum beneath a piston so that atmospheric pressure would make it descend; but he effected condensation by the clumsy device of taking away the fire, so, though his plan was sound in theory, it was hopelessly unpractical. Thomas Savery, in 1698, patented what he called a "Fire Engine," which, though behind Papin's ideas, was of practical use. He published also the *Miners' Friend*, in which he explained his invention and advised its application to clear mines of water. His engine consisted of two vessels communicating with the boiler and also with the well. Steam was admitted and condensed to form a vacuum, whereon the water was sucked from the well into the vessel. Steam was again turned on, and the pressure acting on the surface of the water caused it to close the valve by which it entered and open another valve leading into a pipe, up which it would be forced to a height determined by the pressure used. The two vessels were filled and emptied alternately, and thus a continuous stream of water could be raised to a height. At the first trial Savery's engine threw water to the roof and struck off the tiles. He erected one at Camden House which pumped 3,110 gallons in an hour and burnt a bushel of coal in twenty-four hours. Several of his engines were erected in Cornwall, but when the depth was great it was necessary to employ two or three engines, one above another, and it was impossible to work economically. Besides, the pressure necessary to raise an 80-foot column of water found out weak places in Savery's boilers. Explosions were frequent, and where three engines were in use together, one was generally out of order, thus stopping all three. None the less, the engine set up at Huel Vor was thought an improvement, and sent the miners to greater depths.

Savery's Fire Engine.

Thomas Newcomen, who was a contemporary of Savery's, took the next step. Savery had used no piston. Newcomen's use of it was a great advance. In his engine steam was admitted to the cylinder under the piston, and then condensed; atmospheric pressure caused the piston to fall, and as the piston was attached by a rod to a pivoted beam, with the pump on the other side, the pump was raised. Steam was again admitted, and the weight of the pumping gear pulled the

Newcomen.

piston up, thus preparing the engine for another condensation and another stroke. The difficulty was how to condense the steam, but by accident it was found that a spirt of cold water thrown into the cylinder was most effective. Newcomen and his partner Calley set up their first engine at Griff, in Warwickshire, and others at Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Austhorpe. Cornwall then took a number, one with a cylinder of 47 inches in diameter being set up at Gwennap. Improvements were made by Potter, Beighton, and Smeaton, the latter of whom made much more powerful engines. One built by him at Chacewater in 1775 had steam cylinders 6 feet in diameter, and made a stroke of 9½ feet. The pumps were in three lifts of 100 feet each, and were 16¾ inches in diameter. The cylinder weighed 6½ tons, and was fed by three boilers. The engine was of 76 horse-power. In 1767 there were 57 engines at work near Newcastle of collectively 1,200 horse-power; and Price, in 1778, says that Newcomen's invention had sent the miners twice as deep, though the engine still left much to be desired. "Every fire engine of magnitude consumes £3,000 worth of coals a year." Newcomen's engines were costly from several causes: the vacuum secured was far from perfect; the cylinder was unprotected and lost heat rapidly; but worst of all was the loss of heat due to condensation in the cylinder. In so vast a vessel much water was required—in fact, the water-jet was usually worked with a 20-foot head—and the costliness of alternately heating and cooling the cylinder for each stroke was excessive. Faulty as the Newcomen engine was, yet it was not a toy. It did work, and that effectively, although expensively. A great mistake is made in thinking that before Watt the steam-engine was of no use in industry. It was limited to one use—pumping, and consequently mainly used in one industry—namely, mining, although the water pumped by it might be used for other purposes, such, for example, as providing a blast for furnaces.

Engines in General Use.

Pottery is chiefly associated with the name of Josiah Wedgwood; but although he did very much to improve taste and processes, yet there were many others in the field, who, though of less fame, yet were doing very good work. It is impossible to

Pottery and Porcelain.

give a full account of the numerous firms and the various wares produced, and it must suffice to note the principal processes that were patented, and afterwards to say a word on one or two of the more important firms. In 1744 Heylyn took out a patent for making porcelain and china. His material was "unaker, an earth, the produce of the Chirokee nation in America, the propertys of which are as follows—*videlicet*, to be very fixed, strongly resisting fire, is extremely white, tenacious, and glittering with mica." He gives the proportions to be used. It was then to be kneaded, thrown on the wheel, cast into moulds, or imprinted into utensils. After the first firing, called biscuiting, it could be painted, and then dipped into a glaze, made according to direction, of unaker and a special "glass," and then fired again. In 1748 Frye took out another patent for a certain ware, "not inferior in beauty and fineness and superior in strength" to the ware from the East, known as "China, Japan, or porcelain ware." Frye and Heylyn were concerned in the Bow Works. When the site of what had been Bow Works was dug over in 1869, a great number of fragments were discovered, and these were all of porcelain biscuit; there was no Delft or common earthenware. To return to the patents. White, in 1762, had a patent for crucibles, and the "Count de Laraguais of London" another for a new method of making porcelain ware. Josiah Wedgwood's one patent is dated 1769. It was for the purpose of ornamenting earthen and porcelain ware with an encaustic gold bronze, together with a peculiar species of encaustic painting in various colours, in imitation of the ancient Etruscan and Roman earthenware. But Wedgwood did not care about patenting his new processes. The most interesting patent of the time was that of William Cookworthy. He was the first to make porcelain from native materials. All the porcelain made in England before his time was either not true hard porcelain, or else was made from materials brought from abroad, either from China or elsewhere, such as the earth from the "Chirokee nation" used by Heylyn. It is said that some of the kaolin used to come from China as ballast, until the Chinese, learning what use it was put to in England, stopped the export of it. But in 1745 Cookworthy, who was established in Plymouth as a wholesale druggist, had his attention called to the question of porcelain.

He writes:—"I had lately with me the person who hath discovered the china earth . . . 'twas found in the back of Virginia, where he was in quest of mines, and, having read Du Halde, discovered both the petunse and kaulin. They can import it for £13 a ton." This seems to have started Cookworthy on trying to find the materials in England. He was successful. The two things wanted were "Petunse" and "Caulin," as Cookworthy terms them, the flesh and bones of china ware. "The stone of this Petunse is a species of granite. . . . I first discovered it in the parish of Germo, in a hill called Tregonnin Hill"; and for the kaolin, "There are inexhaustible stores of this Caulin in two Western counties. The use it's commonly put to is in mending the furnaces and fire-places of the fire engines." He obtained it first from Tregonnin Hill, and afterwards from many places in Cornwall. Cookworthy arranged with the owners of the land for an exclusive supply of the materials, set up works at Plymouth, and in 1768 obtained a patent for the exclusive use of native materials in the manufacture of hard paste porcelain. In 1774 Cookworthy sold his patent right to Richard Champion, of Bristol, who, obtaining an extension of the patent right for another fourteen years, began the manufacture of Bristol china. The extension of the patent was violently opposed by the Staffordshire potters, especially by Wedgwood, who urged that Champion was not the discoverer, but the purchaser, and that the use of native materials should be free to all. These were high principles used to support a poor cause. But there is no doubt Wedgwood showed shrewdness as well as generosity in refusing to patent his own improvements. Patents bred expensive lawsuits; the best protection lay in good workmanship. If imitation was only inferior imitation, then it was not really formidable. And it was by the quality of his work, the excellence in taste, design, and execution, the novelty of his wares, that Wedgwood made his reputation. Wedgwood was an old name among Burslem potters, for Aaron Wedgwood was in business there early in the eighteenth century. Josiah Wedgwood was apprenticed there to his brother Thomas in 1744. He set up for himself at the Churchyard Works in 1759, taking on other work as his business grew.

Cornish China Clay.

Wedgwood.

In 1762, according to a story which, however, is not well authenticated, he made for the queen a specimen of "Queen's ware," a cream-coloured ware of fine glaze, and received the title of "Potter to her Majesty." His name was made. "It is really amazing," he writes, "how rapidly the use has spread almost over the whole globe and how universally it is liked." In 1769 he opened his new works at Etruria. In 1773 he was making "a composition of terra cotta resembling porphyry, lapis lazuli, jasper, and other beautiful stones of the vitrescent or crystalline class; a fine black porcelain having nearly the same properties as the basaltes"; and thirdly, "a fine white biscuit ware or terra cotta, polished and unpolished." In 1774 he made a new variety —a fine white terra cotta of great beauty and delicacy, proper for cameos, portraits, and bas-reliefs. This was afterwards worked up into the "Jasper" ware, which had the general qualities of the basalts, together with that of receiving colours throughout its whole substance. The secret of it lay in the use of cawk (sulphate of baryta) from Derbyshire. Many experiments were necessary before it was perfect, Wedgwood giving his partner formulas in French with his private numbers for the ingredients, and writing:—"You can hardly conceive the difficulty and trouble I have had in mixing two tons of this composition, and leaving everybody as wise as they were." In 1785 he invented the jasper dip, by which the goods were left white inside. But what distinguished Wedgwood far more than striking inventions was the immense labour he bestowed on making everything first-rate of its kind. No detail was too small for him, no course of investigation too toilsome, too disheartening, or too expensive. No hint was left neglected. Tools, patterns, designs, all occupied his mind. He sought to employ the best men, and to employ them suitably. He recognised the merit of Flaxman's work, although he wrote to Bentley of him, "It s but a few years since he was a most Supreme Coxcomb, but a little more experience may have cured him of his foible." Flaxman, as a modeller, was indeed valuable, and from 1775 he did a great quantity of work for Wedgwood. His first bill to Wedgwood for three vases, and twenty "Bass Relievos" (mostly classical subjects) was only £15 9s. 3d. His prices did not remain so moderate for long. But Wedgwood cared

more for quality than for cheapness, and always employed Flaxman for his best things. Great as was the benefit conferred on the ceramic art by Wedgwood's new processes, the benefit from the high standard of work which he set was incalculably greater.

Derby and Chelsea China.

The years 1742–83 cover a period of much activity in the china and earthenware trades, apart from that created by Wedgwood at Burslem. The Derby China Works were begun by Andrew Planché in 1750, but soon came into the hands of William Duesbury, who, in 1763, sent forty-two boxes to London, and sold the contents for £666 17s. 6d. Duesbury purchased and carried on the Chelsea works from 1770–1773, gradually removing the business to Derby. The Chelsea works were closed in 1784. Duesbury also purchased the Bow and Lambeth works. In 1774 the Derby works employed near a hundred men and boys, and several of the painters earned a guinea and a-half a week. There is an interesting catalogue of one of Duesbury's sales in 1781, at which the top price (£30 9s.) was fetched by "an elegant Seve-pattern complete desert-service, enamel'd with roses and rich mosaic and gold border." The Worcester Porcelain Company was founded by Dr. Wall and others in 1751, and at first chiefly imitated Oriental productions. Whether printing on china with transfers from copper plates was discovered at Worcester or not, it was practised there in 1757. Sadler, of Liverpool, obtained a patent for the same process in 1756, but a poem in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1757, speaking of a printed portrait of the King of Prussia on a Worcester cup, says :—

> "What praise, ingenious Holdship, is thy due,
> Who first on porcelain the fair portrait drew!"

An extempore addition to this appeared in 1758 :—

> "Handcock, my friend, don't grieve, though Holdship has the praise;
> 'Tis yours to execute—'tis his to wear the bays."

Of these three claimants it seems that Sadler has the best claim. He was an engraver, and the idea of transfer-printing was suggested to him in the following way. He used to give spoilt prints from his plates to his children, and they were in the habit of putting them on the broken pieces of

pottery which served them for toys. Sadler, in partnership with Green, tried experiments, and according to his statement on oath, printed at Liverpool, in 1756, 1,200 earthenware tiles in six hours. The process was further developed, and Wedgwood sent a good many things to be printed by Sadler. Duesbury also practised printing at Derby in 1765, and the use of transfers soon became general.

Canals.

Although the first canal in England was made to convey coal from the Duke of Bridgewater's pits at Worsley to Manchester, yet no industry in the end benefited by the canals more than pottery. Canals offered a better and cheaper means of carriage than any previously existing; but with many things, such as coal and iron goods, railways, offering increased speed to compensate for higher rates, have since competed successfully with the canals. But for all china and earthenware goods, canal carriage is still the most convenient, as there is much less risk of breakage. England was backward in the matter of canals. Not only Holland, but also France was far ahead in the matter. A little had been done in England towards improving the navigation of rivers. In 1656 Francis Mathew had proposed to connect the Isis and Avon by a canal, and the same idea flitted through other men's minds, but nothing much was done, although during the first half of the eighteenth century the beds of the Mersey, Irwell, Weaver, Aire, Calder, and Sankey were improved. But the rates charged were high: 3s. 4d. a ton was charged for the shortest distance by the Mersey Navigation Company. To send by river from Manchester to Liverpool cost 12s. per ton; road carriage cost 40s., and the price charged for carrying coal from Worsley to Manchester more than doubled the price of the coal at the pit's mouth: this is perhaps hardly remarkable when we remember that coal was sent in paniers on horseback, 280lb. being the usual load. The Duke of Bridgewater obtained two acts (1759–60) granting him powers to construct a canal from his pits at Worsley to Manchester. The work was planned and carried through by the ingenuity of the Duke's engineer, James Brindley. Brindley began work as

Improvement of River Navigation.

The Duke of Bridgewater and Brindley.

an apprentice millwright, and was thought an unusually clumsy one. But although he could scarcely write or draw at all, his cleverness with all kinds of machinery was most remarkable. He saw what was required in a piece of work, the difficulties in the way, and the practical way to overcome them. His habit was, when he was puzzled, to go to bed and think it out; and so, often without plans or estimates, he worked on, attaining success by his natural shrewdness. He at once showed that he was capable of dealing with the problem of canal navigation. His work was simple and strong. He aimed at securing long stretches of level water, and at using as few locks as possible. When required he kept them close together. He was careful to exclude flood water. As far as possible he kept clear of rivers. To him water in a river was a furious giant overturning everything, whereas "if you lay the giant flat on his back he loses all his force whatever his size may be." Thus he proposed to the Duke the bold plan of avoiding the toilsome descent and ascent by locks involved in crossing the Mersey by carrying the canal on a bridge or aqueduct over it. His plan was ridiculed, and an engineer called in to advise condemned it, saying: "I have often heard of castles in the air; but never before saw where one of them was to be erected." But though the idea was novel in England there were aqueducts in plenty to be seen abroad. Barton Aqueduct was built, and the whole canal completed, to the confusion of the theorists, in 1761, and the price of coal in Manchester fell from 7d. per cwt. to 3½d. Not content with this, the Duke set Brindley to work at once on another canal connected with the first at Longford bridge and going to Runcorn. This was also successfully carried through, at a cost of £220,000. Long before it was finished the Duke was at his wits' end for money. On one occasion he sent his steward round to collect scraps of rent in advance to pay his workmen. Brindley got 2s. 6d. and latterly 3s. 6d. a day. He was as economical as he was illiterate. "Ating and drink, 6d.," is a common entry in his diary; or again, "masuring a Cros from Dunham to Warbuton Mercey and Thalwall 3s. 11d., Dunham for 2 diners, 1s. 3d., for the man, 1s. at Thalwall, 1s. 2d. all Night Warington." He could neither spell his employer's title nor his own employment: "to masuor the Duks pools I and Smeaton," and

again "novocion" is his first attempt at navigation, and he seldom got nearer than "novogation."

Brindley's spelling, however, did not affect the commercial success of the canals, and other persons soon desired to have a share in the advantages they offered. Before the Duke's canal was finished, Brindley was making surveys for a canal through Staffordshire, a plan which ended in the Grand Trunk Canal. This started from Runcorn, ran through the salt districts of Cheshire, thence through the Potteries, and then southward to Rugeley, where it turns to the east, passes Burton, and joins the Derwent at Wilden. From here there was river communication to the Humber. The project was supported by Josiah Wedgwood, who himself cut the first sod. The whole length, including branches to Birmingham and the Severn, was 139 miles. The advantages gained by both salt and pottery trades was enormous. But the pottery trades benefited the most, for they used much material brought from long distances, such as flints from south-east England and clay from Cornwall and Devon. Even coal and lime had come like the rest, the last few miles on horseback. And in sending out goods in the same way the risk of breakage was great, and the cost of carriage almost prohibitive, being as high as 1s. per ton per mile. Three pot wagons went from Newcastle-under-Lyme and Burslem weekly to Bridgnorth, and carried about eight tons of pot ware at £3 per ton. About a hundred tons went the same journey on horseback at £2 10s. per ton. Salt was carried over the country in the same fashion. About a hundred and fifty pack-horses went from Manchester to Bridgnorth every week with woollen and cotton goods. The Grand Trunk Canal changed all this. From Etruria to Liverpool a ton went for 13s. 4d. instead of 50s. From Wolverhampton to Liverpool the cost was £1 5s. instead of £5. Wheat, instead of costing 20s. a quarter to go one hundred miles, now went for 5s. Once started, canal making went on apace. Brindley, before his death in 1772, himself planned 365 miles of canals (adding the Wolverhampton, Coventry, Droitwich, Oxford, and Chesterfield canals to those mentioned), and he was consulted about many others in all parts of the country. The movement spread to

The Grand Trunk Canal.

The benefit to the Pottery Trade.

The Growth of the Canal System.

Scotland, where, among others, the Forth and Clyde and Crinan canals were constructed. Between 1790 and 1794 eighty-one canal Acts were obtained, and the country was covered with a network of waterways, some urgently needed, others less required. Tales of enormous profit brought in the speculator, and haste and carelessness led to much waste of money, and in some cases to panic and ruin. But these evils were accidental; the gain to industry was immediate and permanent.

Brindley's work is remarkable because so much of it was original. He had to plan and train his workmen to execute what had not been done in England before. Barton Aqueduct is but one example of the soundness of his judgment. Equally remarkable are the big embankment across Stretford Meadows, the way the canal was carried across Sale Moor Moss, the great tunnel 2,880 yards long at Hare Castle, contemptuously alluded to by the scoffers as another of Brindley's "Air Castles" until they were silenced by the success of the undertaking. It was thought that the embankment at Stretford would never hold the water; but Brindley knew the virtues of clay puddle. He showed also that powdered lime dusted on its layers would hold a wet embankment from slipping; and that gravel or sand could be made water-tight by shaking it together with iron bars and washing down loam or soil. The canal was prevented from sinking in its passage across Sale Moor Moss by driving timber to form a supporting case or frame till the work was complete, and thus building up the embankment bit by bit. As soon as a section of the canal was finished it was used for the conveyance of earth and material for the rest. For this he used double boats with a trough supported between them, capable of carrying seventeen tons. Trap doors in the bottom of the trough allowed the stuff to be discharged in an instant. The boats were conducted from the canal into caissons placed at the proper points, their contents let go, and thus the work was carried on in a way that saved, when compared with carting, 5,000 per cent. Floating carpenters' shops and floating forges saved time and trouble. Brindley made good use of the steam engine of his day, especially in keeping down the water while cutting the Hare Castle

Brindley and Engineering.

Tunnel on the Grant Trunk Canal, and he also called into existence the sturdy race of navigators or "navvies" as we know them, men accustomed to hard work, with rough and ready skill in dealing with large masses of material. Thus later, when the time for railways came, there was no lack of workmen with the knowledge necessary to construct them.

A. L. SMITH. Finance.

At the end of the Walpole period of peace and good finance, the National Debt was about £46,000,000. The two wars of "Jenkins' ear" and the Austrian succession raised it to £77,500,000. The Seven Years' War cost over eighty millions; the American War, ninety-seven millions. Thus, in 1783, the funded debt stood at £212,000,000, the unfunded being £19,000,000 more. The nineteen years of peace, 1748–56, and 1764–75, had effected but an insignificant reduction. In 1737 the Sinking Fund had been complacently described as "a certain way of paying off all our debts." But this fund consisted only of surplus balances, and its normal yield (£1,250,000 in 1749, £1,800,000 in 1772) was not always forthcoming. Some saving was effected by Pelham's conversion of the four per cents. in 1750 to three per cents. by 1757. But there were periodical alarms about this "gigantic and intolerable burden of indebtedness"; as in 1755, when it was urged in debate that a new war might well cost us fifty millions, and that no one could say where the capitalists would be found who could lend so much, and where the funds on which to borrow it. On the other side it was often pointed out that our Parliamentary good faith brought to our feet the treasures of all the moneyed men of Europe; that we could raise loans at half the interest that it cost the French; that we could still borrow at 3 per cent.; and that governments must consider not merely the maxim of "paying your way," but also what the people are able and what they are willing to bear. As Henry Fox said, a land tax of 4s. in the £ on a true assessment would have brought in enough to make both loans and custom duties superfluous; these, therefore, were the penalties of popular ignorance and impatience of taxation, which had rejected poll taxes and hearth taxes, and would submit to no increase in excise or

The National Debt.

in window tax or land tax. Heavy as the load was, it was in the nature of mortgages on newly acquired estates; and the nation could afford to pay out of its victory over its commercial rivals and the consequent enormous expansion of its own resources. It was no idle boast when Burke, in 1767, offered to prove that England was the most lightly taxed State, and its revenue the best constituted, of any that ever the world had beheld.

Colonial Taxation.

In 1763 the fourteen North American colonies contained a population just over two millions, of whom three-quarters were whites. That is, the colonists were then nearly one-third as numerous as the inhabitants of England and Wales. But their rate of increase was so much more rapid than the home rate, that Malthus (p. 481) was able to prove from it the capacity of population to double itself in less than twenty-five years. The total volume of English trade had increased enormously in the eighteenth century; and yet the proportion which English trade with these colonies bore to the total had increased in a far greater ratio—from one-twelfth to one-third of the whole. They might seem ripe for independence, yet Franklin was doubtless correct when, in his evidence before the Commons' Committee, he said that nothing could have been better than the temper of the colonies towards England before 1763; that they cost nothing to govern them but pen, ink, and paper; and that they were led by a thread. "To be an Old Englandman was in itself a kind of rank." So Burke defined their attitude as one of "unsuspecting confidence in the Mother Country"; the ties which bound them were light as air, but strong as links of iron. The war just concluded had been fought in Europe for America, as Pitt claimed. But America had done its part. The colonists had raised 20,000 troops, often equipping more than the quota imposed. They incurred debt to the amount of two and a half millions; and the charges for paying-off this debt were equivalent to taxes proportionately as heavy as those in England. Massachusetts alone had supplied 7,000 men and a warship, and paid £80,000 a year. But beneath these appearances of loyalty and cordiality there was already much tension of feeling. They inherited all the English jealousy on the point of taxation. Their popular

government and free religion, their passion for legal studies, their pride as slave owners, created "a fierce spirit of liberty." They had long felt the tyrannical sway of the policy of the Navigation Acts (IV., p. 454), which were only endurable while evasion was connived at. These Acts allowed the colonists to dispose of that which the Mother Country could not take, and without which they could not pay. A great empire had been established and a huge national debt incurred "for the sole purpose of raising up a nation of customers"; a policy unintelligent even in a people of shopkeepers. America must send all its products, except rice, sugar, and skins, to England alone; it was refused leave to export hats or woollens, to work steel, or even to restrict the import of slaves. It is true that this was part of the general European view of "plantations"; England was less oppressive and illiberal than any other colonial power. It is true, also, that bounties were given to encourage the American production of indigo, hemp, flax, timber, etc. Moreover, the "non-enumerated" articles (grain, salt meats, fish, rum, etc.), could be exported freely if in English ships. A system of drawbacks, too, often let Continental goods be sold cheaper in America than in England. Above all a vast illicit trade with the French West Indies had grown up unchecked. Smuggling was univeral and almost recognised. It was not so much the system itself as it had worked hitherto, but the attempt to enforce it as a reality introduced by Grenville, whose mistimed conscientiousness led him to read the American despatches, that caused the colonies to revolt. He saw England saddled with a debt of ninety millions for a "colony war." He saw the lever which the Crown held in the fact that it appointed and paid the customs officials, and could try revenue cases in its Admiralty Courts without a jury. But he failed to see how the war had relieved the colonies from fear of France; how much they made of the distinction, convenient if illogical, between port duties for the regulation of commerce, and internal taxes for revenue imposed by an assembly in which they felt themselves unrepresented. His Stamp Act (p. 177) was a ludicrous failure and had to be repealed. Yet it is difficult not to condemn the Americans' attitude alike on technical and legal grounds, and on the broader ground of patriotism, despite the

The Dispute with the American Colonies.

rhetoric of Chatham, the splendid inconclusiveness of Burke, Camden's citation of "laws of nature," and the shifting pleas of Franklin. Was America to contribute nothing to the navy, to ignore the debt, and yet to decline even sharing in the cost of a local military force? Could Whig statesmen accept the view that the colonies should make what grants they pleased direct to the Crown? Was the proposal to admit their representatives to Parliament in the least feasible? Certainly English statesmanship was to the last degree vacillating and provocative, just as English public opinion was first blind and then obstinate. But it is impossible to believe, however honestly such men as Washington strove to believe, that anything could have long averted the now inevitable rupture. To accompany the Repeal of the Stamp Act by an Act declaratory of Parliament's right to tax was no doubt a fatal conjunction of two irreconcilable policies. But the declaration was almost necessitated by the growing irritation against America, by the fact that Parliament had already twice committed itself to the principle, and by the Ministry's inability to carry the repeal except at this price. At the time all seemed well. The colonies had won their practical point. After the violent storm there was at once, said Burke, an unparalleled calm. But beneath this calm there were still all the elements of danger. Opinion in America was ripening fast. The feeling in England was growing so fast that a humiliating surrender had been made. In 1767 Charles Townshend, "driven on by the courtiers," as Burke puts it, began to try that impossible task, at once to tax and to please.

> "To render the tax palatable to the partisans of American revenue, he made a preamble stating the necessity of such a revenue. To close with the American distinction, this revenue was external or port duty; but again to soften it to the other party, it was a duty of supply. To gratify the colonists it was laid on British manufactures; to satisfy the merchants of Britain the duty was trivial, and (except that on tea, which touched only the devoted East India Company) on none of the grand objects of commerce. To counteract the American contraband, the duty on tea was reduced from a shilling to threepence. But to secure the favour of those who would tax America, the scene of collection was changed, and with the rest it was levied in the colonies. What need I say more?" (Burke).

The estimated revenue of £40,000 was to pay salaries of judges and officials in America. But "the fine-spun scheme

had the usual fate of all exquisite policy." The Americans saw in it a vista of corruption and jobbery, placemen and courtier-judges. They saw the whole scheme of taxation revived, and they retaliated by repudiating the distinction between taxes and duties; by clamouring not merely for no taxation, but also for no legislation, without representation; and by disowning the authority of Parliament, though still professing to obey the Crown. The net product of Townshend's precious scheme was £295 the first year. True that its indirect effect was that tea worth 6s. per lb. in England was sold in America for 3s. But to the Americans this seemed a clumsy bribe to make the assertion of right pass, and to cover the menacing preamble. They formed unions to take no tea from England; other imports they received; and Lord North gave another instance of the shortsightedness of statesmen when, in 1771, he announced that the troubles were over, and in 1772 that there was the fairest prospect he had ever known of a long peace. To this prophecy the Boston Tea Party, December, 1773, was the answer. The 3d. on tea, which the colonists refused to pay, was not unjustly compared to the 20s. ship-money which Hampden refused to pay. This duty had been retained with the view of aiding the East India Company; without their sale of tea in America, the company was in danger of bankruptcy. Such were the results of the mercantilist policy upon the Eastern and the Western worlds.

The Tea Ships at Boston.

No wonder that some bold thinkers argued that the extension of colonies was a mistake, that they were a mere weakness, and the supposed trade benefits a mere delusion. So wrote Dean Tucker; and Adam Smith declared that our American trade regulations were "a violation of the most sacred rights of humanity"; that our monopoly of trade in the colonies was a dead loss to us; and that could men only believe it, separation would be best for both; while, short of that, the best plan was to free their trade and give them representation in Parliament. Burke and Chatham would not hear of separation, and considered the scheme of colonial representation in Parliament impracticable: they believed in conciliation. Taxation was to be by colonial grant; if some refused to grant, then and then only was the compelling

power of the Crown to be applied. "Leave America to tax herself; keep up no more than the old trade laws; return to the policy of the past 160 years; repeal the tea duty." This was just the prevalent opinion of the English commercial classes, to whom experience had made clear the folly of taxing America, but not the folly of the trade monopoly in America. Unfortunately, the flame in America had now spread from taxes to monopolies; while feeling in England was one of vindictive anger mixed with contempt. With the meeting of Congress, September, 1774, "the die was now cast," as the King said, correcter in his foresight than was Washington, who at this very time disbelieved in separation. Nor did the majority of Americans see whither they must drift: they thought their agreements to reject imports from the home country would cut off two-thirds of its trade and bring it to the verge of ruin; they were misled, too, by the past vacillations in English policy which had seemed to shift with every mail from America. But the general feeling in England now was that which Gibbon expressed when, writing at the time of the debate in February, 1775, he declared it to be the crisis of both our trade and our empire.

Adam Smith and Economic Policy.

Adam Smith had criticised severely the taxation system then prevailing. The land tax was unequal in assessment, and fixed in valuation. Tithe was absurdly unequal, and a discouragement to improvements. The window tax ought to be an inhabited house duty. Ground rents should be taxed. An income tax he thought would be unendurable, and would frighten away capital. Licences he approved; but the shop-tax proposed in 1759 would have been thoroughly bad. Stamp duties he pronounced to be both oppressive and essentially unequal. The necessaries of life were taxed as if they were luxuries: salt was made to pay 300 per cent., leather 10, soap 25, candles 15, coals about 60. Corn bounties, high import duties on corn and cattle, were equally bad. Many articles had been driven out of use by prohibitory duties; "for in the customs, two and two often make not four but one" (Swift). The system of bounties and drawbacks, perquisites and privileges, made the expense of the customs 30 per cent. of their net produce. It would be better to draw the bulk of this revenue from a few main articles—sugar

rum, tobacco, tea, coffee, china, spices. We should aim not at monopoly but at revenue, and should feel our way by experiment. Smuggling should be obviated by an extended warehousing system. Above all, the raw materials of our manufactures should be imported duty free. The malt, beer, and ale duties ought to be turned into a malt tax, which at a less rate would produce more than they did, and beer and ale would be cheaper.

It could only be said that the English system, with all its defects, was better than that of other European countries. The interior commerce of Great Britain, the inland and the coasting trade, were "almost entirely free." Not only was there no taille, as in France; no excise on bread, as in Holland; no duty on all sales, as in Spain; but there was none of the monstrous division into fiscal provinces, the government monopolies, the farming-out of taxes, which in all their stupidity and cruelty were so marked elsewhere.

The Effect of the "Wealth of Nations."

It is sometimes said that the "Wealth of Nations" did not exert its full practical effects till a generation after its date of publication. But this is inaccurate in regard to its effects on fiscal policy. These effects were striking and immediate. The book was at once used as a mine of suggestions for fiscal novelties and reforms, such as the tax on menservants, 1777, the rating of inhabited houses, the tax on posting and the malt duty, 1779, and many others. Above all, the simplification of the customs by Pitt in 1784, and his reduction of the monstrous duty on tea from 119 to 12½ per cent., were the initiatory steps of a great fiscal reform, for which he confessed himself indebted to Adam Smith, though the Great War threw back the completion for some forty years.

The "Mercantile" Theory.

A suicidal colonial policy and a policy crippling to progress at home were the results of the "mercantile" theory which had dominated the economic field for two centuries (III., p. 362; IV., p. 457). This theory represented the development of national spirit and national rivalries consequent on the break-up of the mediæval idea of a united Christendom. It applied on a larger scale the mediæval scheme of restrictions and regulations of commerce and industry. It is not quite fair to regard the theory as one which identified wealth

with money, for its best upholders were careful on this point. But in an age of expanding trade, of great wars with their calls upon the Treasury, of the discovery of ever new "funds" on which to borrow, it was easy to exaggerate the importance of the amount of money circulating in a country at a given time; to speak of it not merely as the index but as the cause of prosperity; to make it the test of a foreign commerce, whether it brought money into the country; and to measure everything by a fallacious "balance of trade." Men were very apt in the course of their reasonings to let land, houses, and consumable goods slip out of their memories, and talk of the amount of gold and silver as if it were the sole object of a nation's activity. Adam Smith found it quite necessary to point out that the natural course of trade would bring us all the specie we want, just as it does all the wine we want; that buying and selling imply each the other; that money must, and does, run after goods; that excess of imports means a return on investments; that nations, like individuals, can only grow rich by producing more than they use.

The mercantile theory had by his time passed out of its cruder stages, when it sought its object by prohibition of export of specie, by fixing legal rates of exchange, or by making foreign traders spend their receipts in purchasing native goods. The discussions on the theory had even suggested, however timidly, the fruitful ideas of freedom, of "nature," and of the interests of the community.

The final form which the theory took, the idea of Protection, had been itself considerably modified by the manifold experience gained in the eighteenth century. The landowners' corn, cattle, and wool had been protected both by import duties and by bounties on export. The manufacturers' cloth and iron goods had been protected against foreign and colonial competition. But it was coming to be felt that commerce should be a bond of union between nations, not a source of discord; that British prosperity was not due to these restrictions, but in spite of them; that to allow free imports would no more ruin England than it had ruined Holland; that success had not attended "the erecting of the sneaking arts of underling tradesmen into political maxims for the conduct of a great empire."

It was pointed out that France should be regarded not as

a rival, but as a market, all the more valuable by its proximity; that the interest of a nation was to have all its neighbours as rich as possible; in fact, that the wealth of one nation was bound up with the wealth of other nations. Adam Smith declared roundly that the corn bounty checked the growth of population, stunted the home market, and in the long run diminished the production; while it cheapened English corn for the Dutch, and so helped their artisans to undersell ours. He showed how the bounty on herring busses had killed the boat fishery, raised the price of herrings, and invited pernicious speculation. When he went on to argue further that the mercantile system had sacrificed the consumer to the producer, had looked to the interests of a small group of traders instead of the general interest of the whole nation, he could find his instances ready to his hand in recent and familiar history. His attack on the system was, moreover, assisted by momentous changes in the economic world of the time. America had just refused to be made any longer the tool of the Mother Country's narrow mercantile policy. The rise of a new race of men had put an end to the political domination of the landowners. Machinery and factories had broken down the old apprenticeship Acts and corporation privileges. Agriculture had become a science. A new spirit had appeared in Poor Law administration. In every direction the ideas which had prevailed since Tudor times were beginning to be discredited. The old alarms—of Dutch or French outstripping us in trade, of the growth of debt proving to be an intolerable burden, of the sources of public revenue becoming exhausted—had pretty well passed away.

Its Overthrow.

A time of expansion had come, a time of buoyancy and confidence. The old view of trade and industry as a struggle of nation with nation, class with class, was giving way to the more modern view of the harmony of economic interests, the co-operation of individuals towards one common end, the social optimism which has since been so rudely shaken. The minds of men were unconsciously ready for the great lesson which is the one main thesis of the "Wealth of Nations"—that of natural liberty. That men are by Nature free and equal is also the axiom of the American Declaration of Independence of 1776. So that the same year saw the death-blow given to the mercantile theory and to its last and worst product, the

colonial system. In fact, the fortress Adam Smith attacked had already been undermined. His work was being done for him. For this reason, as well as on account of his debt to Hume and Anderson, to Tucker and Massie, to Quesnay and Turgot, he is not to be called the creator of political economy. There are striking defects in his book: such as the mistakes about capital and rent and price; and the two erroneous views which he got from the French physiocrats, that much necessary labour is "unproductive," and that in manufacture "Nature does nothing, and man everything." Another defect is his failure to grasp the fact that economic theory and economic institutions are closely related to their surroundings—a fact which disarms his criticism of the mercantilists, not of its logical cogency, but of much of its historical justice. Above all, he is hardly conscious what large assumptions he makes in his use of the terms "Nature," "competition," "labour," "rent," without strict previous definition. He takes for granted that "an invisible hand" so leads men in their individual interests that these all converge in the common weal, and he fails to note how little of this harmony is found when it comes to the distribution of wealth, and how a nation may produce wealth while degrading its workers and creating class hatreds.

But, for all this, the value of the book can hardly be exaggerated. It consists largely in its practicality. He was writing, not for students only, but for statesmen and financiers and business men. He saw the great need of the age was demolition; that the great hope of the immediate future lay in the maxim that the individual can judge his own interests best. But he could admit exceptions—banking, education, the Navigation Acts, a duty on wool export, a temporary monopoly to joint-stock companies. He was wise enough to be an opportunist, and to be prepared to wait; indeed, he declared that to expect entire freedom of trade in Great Britain was as absurd as to expect an Oceana or Utopia. His book is full of acute practical suggestions. No wonder Pulteney said, in 1797, it is converting this generation and will conquer the next. What also aided it was the arrangement and plan of the book, so informal and unpedantic; its combination of deductive and inductive method, so well fitted to be the source of an historical as well as of an abstract

school of economics; the broad view it takes of human life, so contrasted with "the economic man" of some later writers. It is remarkable that while his great aim was the demolition of abuses, he should have succeeded also in constructing so much that has proved permanent; and that, practical writer as he was, the one thing of supreme importance in him should be his contribution to the theory of his subject; for it has been noted that it was he who first showed how "value" measures human motive—that is, how much of human activity is measurable, and, therefore, open to science. Much of his influence was due to the exact date at which his book appeared—early enough to administer the *coup de grâce* to the old system of obstruction and to champion the cause of land and of labour, but not too soon to ride on the advancing wave of a new industrial epoch.

A. L. SMITH. National Economy: Pauperism.

GILBERT'S returns gave the cost of the Poor Law about 1784 as two million pounds; about 1742 it had been over six hundred thousand pounds, *i.e.* it had increased six times as much as the increase of population. Moreover, this alarming increase had been now gathering force for twenty years.

What were its causes? There was one sapient class of politicians and pamphleteers who opined, with certain grand juries, that it was all due to "the habitual luxury and idleness of the poor," or their "profligacy," or to gin-drinking, or to ale-houses. Arthur Young traced it to the pernicious habit of tea-drinking. A more serious cause had long ago been indicated by Defoe, when he noted the absence of a pauper class in the districts where domestic industries prevailed. But the domestic system was coming under the control of capitalism; the knitting frames at Nottingham and Leicester, the looms at Manchester, were owned by a few masters. The "manufacturer" class became differentiated from the agricultural labourers; and with the severance each class was more exposed to the dislocations of industry and violent fluctuations of trade due to the Continental wars. Nor could these disturbances find their natural adjustment; the Settlement Laws still checked the mobility of labour, preventing the labourer from taking his services to the best market, and the employer from getting the labour he wanted.

"It was harder," as Adam Smith puts it, "for a poor man to pass the artificial boundary of a parish, than an arm of the sea or a ridge of high mountains." Overseers, by merely refusing a certificate, had thus the power, practically, to "imprison a man for life," as was remarked by Hay in 1750 and Burn in 1764. The Statute Book itself mentions that sick persons were often removed, to the great danger of their lives, perhaps only to be taken back after appeal. By the agency of these senseless laws, "close parishes" were made possible. In a parish where one man owned all the land, he could clear it of cottages, and throw the cost of his poor labourers upon the neighbouring parishes.

Effect of Enclosure.

In the general opinion of contemporaries, enclosures were often a contributory cause of pauperism, and were one reason why it was so much worse in the south. Enclosures, no doubt, added enormously to the product of agriculture; but Massie, Arthur Young, and Eden all agree they were too often carried out with utter disregard for the interests of the poor. Not only did the enclosures of commons deprive the poor of valuable rights; but also enclosures in the sense of the substitution of "severalties" for the old "champion" system admittedly led to the consolidation of farms, the eviction of small holders, and so, by a circuitous sort of historic justice, to the ultimate increase of poor rates. This was particularly the case where the consolidation was accompanied by the conversion of arable into pasture. In the end, of course, enclosures added to the general wealth of the country, and thereby increased the demand for labour. But in the meantime, they degraded small holders into landless labourers, "who, seeing no opening towards advancement, become regardless of futurity, spend their little wages as they receive them, without reserving a pension for their old age; and if incapacitated from working by a sickness which lasts a very short time, inevitably fall upon the parish." It is a significant fact that in 1774 the Elizabethan Act was repealed which had aimed at securing to every cottage its four acres of ground attached.

But indubitably the chief cause of the advance of pauperism in this period was the rise in prices as compared with wages. The average London price of wheat 1781–84 was 47s. 8d. a

quarter; the average from 1743–80 was 31s., according to the tables given by Eden. The low prices, rising wages, and general plenty of the first half of the eighteenth century, had been followed by a quarter of a century in which prices tended to rise but wages did not. But from 1774 a general concurrence of testimony shows how fatally wages were lagging behind the now fast-rising prices. Howlett, in 1787, computed that in the fifty years preceding, wheat had risen from an average of 32s. a quarter to 45s., while the pay of labour had only gone up 2d. in the shilling. On the other hand, Eden declared ten years later that wages in country districts had doubled since 1737. But in fact, as Arthur Young found on his tours in 1771–2, and as Adam Smith wrote in 1776, there were the widest differences in wages in different districts. Agricultural wages averaged 10s. 9d. a week twenty miles from London, but 6s. 3d. at 110 miles distance, and even 5s. 2½d. in some cases —these figures refer to the southern counties. The lowest agricultural wage found by Young was 4s. 6d.—this was in Lancashire. The east and north-east had the highest rates. Among artisans the Newcastle coal workers earned 15s. a week; the iron workers of Sheffield, the potters of Worcester, the Wakefield weavers, the west country wool-workers, got good wages; but the weavers of Lavenham received only 5s. 9d. He admits that the rise in prices since 1762 had begun to hit the labouring classes, though he declares that as yet it was only superfluities that they had had to retrench. But not only was wheat in 1767–8 nearly double what it stood at 1759–62; meat, butter, etc., were dearer too; and salt, soap, candles, and leather were now or soon brought under contribution for the Seven Years' War and the American War. In 1773 a quarter of wheat would cost a Gloucestershire farm hand ten weeks' labour; nowadays it would cost him between two and three weeks. It is, however, urged by Eden that the price of wheat is no fair criterion of the prosperity of the masses, unless wheat is the common and indispensable food of the people. The well-known writer of tracts on the Corn Trade estimated in 1764 that not half the people habitually eat wheaten bread; rye, oats, and barley were used by the rest. But it is clear that the use of wheaten bread was fast spreading; rye bread and barley

Prices and Wages.

bread began to be "looked upon with a sort of horror," and labourers would say they had lost their rye-teeth. The years of scarcity after 1762 affected all grain. And these years' prices were only the forerunner of an "unparalleled advance" (Eden). It is certain on the whole that before 1784, for the poorer agricultural labourers with families, a terrible and hopeless struggle had already begun. Eighteenth-century society was soon to commence paying a heavy price for its settlement laws and corn laws, its extravagant wars, its neglect of education, and heaviest of all for its belated remorse and its ill-considered attempts at reparation.

Attempted Remedies.

Between the severe Vagrancy Act of 1744 and Gilbert's Act, 1782, there is a marked change in the tone of literature and political discussion on the subject of the poor, a change which gives warning that an era is opening of philanthropy and of sociology. When Fielding, in 1753, proposed to leave the impotent poor to charity, and to force the idle to work at wages assessed, he also wanted work provided for the unemployed as stated in the Act of 1601; and he sums up with this reflection: "All will allow that the poor are now ill-provided for and worse governed . . . their sufferings are less observed than their misdeeds . . . they starve and freeze and rot among themselves, but they beg and steal and rob among their betters." In a similar spirit Massie, writing in 1758, and Burn in 1764, criticised the system severely and justly; the latter adds a criticism of current proposals of reform (and one which is at least as applicable at the present day as it was 130 years ago); that most of them ignore the lessons of the past, and propose plans that have already been tried and found wanting; that most of them attempt too much at a time. Burn's own remedies, besides the repeal of the Settlement Acts, were firstly, the supervision of overseers by a paid head-overseer for each group of parishes; secondly, the making almsgiving as penal as begging. One reformer makes an observation the irony of which is seemingly unintentional, "I do most solemnly declare I look for the same humanity hereafter among parish officers as among other men."

It is a truism that history shows us that nothing is new. In social history this is at least one side of the truth. It is interesting, therefore, to find a century ago schemes for

compulsory insurance—labourers were to be made to provide themselves old-age pensions and funds in case of sickness. It is also interesting to find that the criticism then passed on such schemes was that the labourer could do better for himself, as it was, through the existing friendly societies. Is not this still the case in 1896?

All this attention attracted to the Poor Laws finds its parallel also in the legislation of the period. In 1753 a Bill was brought in for an annual census and annual poor-law returns. Though this failed to pass, yet important returns were moved for and obtained in 1776 and 1786. There were Acts passed in 1761 and 1766 to put pauper children on a register and to board them out in the country. Howlett estimated that these Acts saved annually the lives of 2,000 such children in London. Unfortunately, an Act of 1756 had ordered that admission should be free into the Foundling Hospital, and in consequence the number received there had gone up from 100 to 4,000.

By other Acts, parish apprentices were to be free at twenty-one instead of twenty-four; new rules were made as to apprenticing boys to the Navy, and as to the conduct of hospitals and penitentiaries; and overseers were to be punished for paying the poor in bad money. Above all, Gilbert's Act was passed in 1782. This important statute, so often misunderstood, has more than one aspect. Gilbert introduced three Bills: one to make houses of correction more effective; a second, for the better relief and employment of the poor; a third, against vagrants. Only the first two were passed. One clause of the new law encouraged the union of parishes, a point for which the reformers had been labouring since 1722. The number of parishes which availed themselves of this power was not great; there were only 924, grouped into 67 incorporations; but the way of future progress had been pointed out. Another clause checked the letting out of the poor to contractors; this was a salutary regulation. Another forbade taking the able-bodied into the workhouse; this proved a fatal step, undoing all the use of the "workhouse test" imposed in 1722. This was backed up by other disastrous provisions; finding work for the poor near their own homes was a blunder of the first magnitude and a sham already exposed by Defoe and many

Gilbert's Act.

others; supplementing wages from the rates was the destructive "allowances" system; empowering the justices to appoint visitors and paid guardians was doing a good thing in a bad way, for the action of the justices, even before this, had amply exhibited the mischief of unfettered and irresponsible interference.

Gilbert's Act, then, was a measure which, by giving money to the able-bodied, violated the principle of the Elizabethan Poor Law, and one which undid the good effected by sixty years of vigilant if harsh administration. It fell hopelessly into the confusion between the poor, in the sense of the labouring classes, and the "impotent poor," "the poor in very deed." Being an optional measure, the falsely benevolent clauses were very generally adopted, the wholesome provisions neglected. But withal, partly by its good points, partly by the very way in which it opened the flood-gates to a deluge, it contained within itself the germs of the great reform of 1834.

From the Settlement Act of 1667 there had been a century which might be described as the reign of the overseer. It was natural that there should then set in a reaction, even to a somewhat short-sighted benevolence. This movement of reaction is traceable throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century; victorious in principle from 1782, it became the undisputed practice after 1795. It consists of two parts: a new spirit towards the poor, and a series of new methods for carrying that spirit into effect. The new spirit was good, the new methods were bad. There is no reason why, because we must condemn "allowances" and "colleges of industry," we should not admit that somehow or other wages had to be raised, that some check on industrial unscrupulousness was already called for, and that any régime was preferable to unbridled overseerdom.

Beginnings of Trade Unions.

Among many deep-rooted ideas bequeathed to the eighteenth century from mediæval times was that of the need for a fixity of wages. This fixity was supposed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to be secured by the periodical assessments of wages by the Justices in Quarter Sessions in each county. But these assessments were about 1740 becoming obsolete; one made in 1725 was at the end of the century published as an historical curiosity. The attempt to fix wages

was taken up by the workmen, who combined in Trade Unions to maintain a minimum wage, as the employer and governing classes had since 1350 combined to maintain by legislation a maximum wage. In this respect Trade Unions are analogous to mediæval gilds. A main object of the gild system was not to leave prices and wages to be settled by competition, but to keep up the standard both of workmen and work. The place left vacant by the decay of the gilds was in this respect occupied by the new Trade Unions. But as has been lately shown by Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb, it is a mistake either to trace their descent historically to the gilds, or to make them (as is often done) a resultant of factories and machinery. The factory system may be conveniently dated as beginning in 1785, the year when Arkwright's patent for the water-frame expired, and when Boulton and Watt made the first application of steam power in a cotton mill. Trade Unions, however, date from much earlier in the eighteenth century: from the time, in fact, when the old rigid restraints on labour by means of assessments, settlements, apprenticeship, and municipal privilege, were evaded and ignored, and from the time when the growth of industrial capital made a deep line between employers and employed. Thus, in tailoring, as capital was needed to set up shops, there appear marked divisions of classes, masters, cutters-out, and sewers, the last "as poor as rats." In 1720 complaint was made to Parliament that the journeymen tailors, to the number of 7,000, had combined to raise wages and reduce hours. In 1744 further complaint was made that the law passed in 1720 to fix a maximum wage was not observed; and the same complaint was made in 1767. So in the wool manufacture, the yarn-spinning, the cloth-weaving, the cloth-dressing, were done in cottages; but "the capitalist generally owned the yarn, the loom, the cloth, as much as he did the mill where the cloth was fulled or the warehouses in which it was stored for sale." Petitions to Parliament against combinations of combers and of weavers in Devon and the west began as early as 1717. As the domestic system in the north gave way, Arthur Young tells us, these combinations spread also there; and it is said there was by 1741 a woolcombers' union of the United Kingdom acting partly as a friendly society, but partly to keep up wages and to keep out "blacklegs."

So again in the hosiery manufacture; the frame-knitters had formed a strong union by 1753. The case was similar in the cutlery trade and among the silk weavers.

The general rule, that revolutions arise not when matters are at their worst but when prospects begin to improve, no doubt applies here. The early trade unions indicate to us in what trades the workers were well paid and high spirited. As Mr. Webb says, the curriers, hatters, and woolstaplers, the brush and basket makers, and the calico printers, of the time, formed each a small privileged industrial ring, protected by the laws and the customs of apprenticeship, and by the sympathy of Parliament, against any lowering of wages; *e.g.* the Act of 1756 to ratify "a scheme or table for piece-work wages" of the clothiers of the western counties. But between this time and the year of the publication of the "Wealth of Nations," Parliament had been converted to a diametrically opposite policy by arguments that seemed irresistible in each case. The case of the midland framework knitters may be taken as typical: the story is told in evidence taken before the House of Commons. In their trade charter, the old Apprenticeship Statute (5 Eliz. c. 4) was left to the wardens of the craft to administer. It was consequently neglected. The masters took many apprentices and almost no journeymen; for £5 was often paid by a parish on every boy apprenticed out. In 1710 the workers appealed to the wardens to carry out the Act: when the appeal was in vain, riots occurred which took the form of frame-breaking; which, therefore, in 1727 was made a capital offence. From 1740 onwards there was "sweating" of the most modern type in Northamptonshire. Profits were high, wages very low, and there was a great influx of women's and children's labour. The Midland Association of Framework Knitters (a large trade union) petitioned Parliament in 1778 to fix wages, which had sunk to 6s. a week. It was shown in evidence that the wages had fallen in the last twenty years, while the prices of food and other necessaries had risen; that while the value of a frame was between £6 and £8, the rent paid on it was from 1s. 3d. to 2s. a week, *i.e.* from 50 to nearly 70 per cent.; that a workman who bought a frame for himself was boycotted; that it was the frame-owners' policy to let out

Changing Conditions of Labour.

as many frames and as little work as possible. The workmen were on the verge of starvation. The one argument that was allowed to outweigh all this was that competition prevented the owners from paying more; the trade would be driven abroad. In spite, therefore, of petitions from Tewkesbury, Godalming, London, Westminster, Derby, and the midland centres of the trade, in spite of the riots in Nottingham, things went on. Frames were poured upon the market; apprentices were taken in droves; strikes became frequent. But there was no remedy till the Factory Acts. It was the same story in other industries. Employers proved, or seemed to prove, to helpless Parliamentary Committees that it was suicidal to limit the numbers of apprentices, to insist on a seven years' term, to interfere with the use of machinery. Once, indeed, the Commons summoned to their aid a venerable prejudice. They passed, in 1773, the first of the "Spitalfields Acts" (confirmed in 1782 and 1801), empowering the justices to fix wages for the silk workers for the protection of this industry from the competition of France. Adam Smith's doctrines came therefore just in time: he could point to accomplished facts, and supply the theoretic basis for a policy that had just been forced, bit by bit, into legislative recognition. In 1777 the apprenticeship rules were repealed as regarded the manufacture of hats, though the Act of Elizabeth as a whole, including the fixing of wages by assessment, was not formally repealed till 1813–14, nor the Spitalfields Acts till 1824.

The battle between employers appealing to free contract and competition, and workmen appealing to mediæval survivals, was a foregone conclusion. Adam Smith points out how the masters had all the advantages on their side: they had the Statutes against combining to raise the price of work, but none against combining to lower it; they could combine more easily; they could starve out the men in a few weeks; the men's movements, he remarks, "generally end in nothing but the punishment or ruin of the ringleaders."

In these circumstances what could the workmen do? Their next aims must be Factory Acts and repeal of the laws against combinations. But before they could move effectively in this direction, it was necessary for the isolated associations within each trade to unite and acquire the solidarity of a general "labour movement." Trade unions, as it has been

well put, had to become a comprehensive trade unionism. These steps belong to a later period.

M. BATESON. Social Life.

FOREIGNERS laughed at the English for their love of travel, and called desire to quit their native land the English "Maladie du pays." The qualification for the fashionable "Dilettanti Club" (1734: p. 270) was a knowledge of Italy. In 1786 Walpole writes: "France, Nice and Switzerland swarm with us; gaming has transported half." Fashion, idleness and illness took many others, and that in spite of the many real hardships all travellers had to endure, especially travellers by sea.

Travel by Sea.

Fielding's account of his voyage to Lisbon (1756) contains a graphic description of passenger life on board ship. Having determined to leave London in search of health, he at first wished to go to Aix-les-Bains, but could hear of no ship sailing, within any reasonable time, to Marseilles or any other neighbouring port. Accordingly, he took passage for himself and his wife and daughter in a merchant vessel, "with excellent accommodation for passengers," including separate "state-rooms." As there were no landing-stages anywhere, Fielding, who had lost the use of his limbs through the progress of his disease, suffered terribly in getting from the shore of the Thames to the ship. There was a long delay in the Thames, due partly to the numerous holidays of the custom-house officers, which made it impossible to clear the ship, and to many other causes. Meanwhile Fielding was tapped for the dropsy, in order to show the man who was to act as "steward, cook, butler, sailor, and surgeon" how to do it if occasion arose on the voyage. Before the final departure from England a month elapsed, spent in waiting for winds in the Channel. The vessel was in collision on two successive days.

Fielding's Voyage to Lisbon.

Smollett had painful experiences, in 1763, when he crossed the Channel to go to Nice for the winter. At Dover he arranged with the master of a packet-boat to go to Boulogne for five guineas. The cabin was so small, the beds so dirty

The Channel Crossing.

and inaccessible, that the family decided to sit up all night. Next day the master played them the usual trick when he refused to land them, and made them get into an open boat a league off shore. As the Boulogne watermen claimed the right to carry all passengers on shore, the Smolletts had to get into another boat in a very rough sea, and to "gratify" all three crews. Again, coming from Flushing to Dover, Smollett paid his passage of one guinea on the understanding that he should have a bed. But there were only eight beds for sixteen passengers. At all ports, too, it was a hard matter to land or to embark till the beginning of the present century, when Rennie began to improve harbours and make landing-stages. The packet-boats were now used by all classes; there were but few private yachts.

Dover.

Foreigners arriving in England thought that the English custom-house officers were very humble, as they did not search the passengers' pockets or linen-bags; but many fees had to be paid for the redemption of luggage. Foreigners, as a rule, testify that, though everything was very dear in England, the same prices were charged to foreigners as to the English. The charges at Dover and on the road from London to Dover were notoriously high. To escape a Sunday in Dover a Frenchman, Grosley, in 1772, paid a guinea for a seat in a "flying machine," carrying four passengers, and drawn by six horses, which ran in defiance of the law against Sunday travel. The party were much stared at, but by travelling on the day of rest they escaped the "collectors of the highway," and saw only such as were dangling upon gibbets at the roadside, fully dressed, with wigs upon their heads.

Roads.

The road from Dover to London is not one of Arthur Young's four good roads. He praises only the piece from Salisbury to Romsey, the Great North Road from London to Barnet, the road to Chelmsford, and a small piece of new road in Wales. All the rest it would be "a prostitution of language to call turnpikes"; in turn he calls them vile, execrable, execrably vile. He complained especially of the cutting of "grips" across the road, which let the water off, but also caused many an overturn; the grip was a favourite method of draining in Norfolk and Suffolk, where he found not one mile of good road.

When a duke proposed to journey into Sussex, in 1746, word was sent from London that keepers and persons who knew the holes and sloughs should come to meet his Grace, with lanterns and long poles to help him on his way. Long journeys from the north were best performed on horseback, for from Glasgow to Grantham there was no turnpike, only a narrow causeway with soft unmade road on each side, a pack-horse way. In 1760 the coach from Edinburgh to London left once a month, and took sixteen days for the journey, over a considerable part of which there was no turnpike. Whenever new turnpikes were made, they were violently resisted, as the toll was considered an unjust exaction. It was made felony to remove a toll-bar, but it was not easy to protect a long line of road against systematic attack.

It has been estimated that 452 Acts for making and repairing roads were passed in the period 1762–74, yet the engineering of roads remained a dead art in England. When a blind carrier proposed to contract for a portion of new turnpike his tender was accepted, because it was the lowest; professional engineers did not undertake such work. John Metcalf, or Blind Jack of Knaresboro', as it happened, was a genius, and performed his contract admirably. But he invented no new method, and no real improvement was effected till the beginning of the present century, when a new school of engineers proposed radical reforms.

Palmer's mail coaches, started in 1784, reformed to some extent the postal service, hitherto conducted by boys on post-horses. Palmer, the lessee of a theatre in Bath and of one in Bristol, found that the mail took three days to do a journey he often did in one; so he proposed that the Post Office should arrange a coach service. The scheme, at first declared impracticable, was found to work well. The first to run did the journey from Bristol to London in fourteen hours. In 1792 sixteen mail coaches left the General Post Office daily, and to see the start was a City sight. The coach carried only five passengers, four inside and one out, and was accompanied by an armed guard. The robbery of mailbags then became a thing of the past.

Mail Coaches.

In the same year another important postal reform was effected, when letter-carriers were put into uniform for the

first time, wearing a scarlet cloth coat, with blue lapels, blue linings of padua, blue waistcoat, and hat with a gold band.

Inns and Food.

To an Englishman coming home from abroad the English inn, with its "twopenny prints, salt-cellars, and boxes to hold the knives," seemed very luxurious, but the *summum bonum*, says Horace Walpole, is small beer and the newspaper. The English landlord's complaisance was found a pleasant change after French rudeness; Smollett observes that in France everyone is complaisant except the publican; in England it is *vice versâ*. Arthur Young's interesting lists of the meals he got and the prices he paid show that the traveller was not then, as now, afflicted by a too great uniformity in items and prices. He tells of suppers at eightpence a head; of mutton-steaks, ducks, tarts, and cheese, mushrooms, capers, walnuts, and gherkins for two shillings. At Scarborough he found the New Inn very cheap, but very dirty, and had cold ham, chicken, lobster, tarts, anchovies, and cheese for one-and-fourpence, coffee or tea, sixpence. Newcastle he enters as civil but extravagantly dear—a boiled fowl, oysters, and one woodcock, half-a-crown a head; Carlisle, good—a broiled chicken, a plover, plate of sturgeon, tarts, mince pies, and jellies, eighteenpence a head; Penrith, good and cheap—roast beef, apple pudding, potatoes, celery, potted trout and sturgeon, a shilling a head; Kendal, good and very cheap—a boiled fowl and sauce, a roast partridge, potted char, cold ham, tarts, and three or four sorts of foreign sweetmeats, eightpence each, for three people. Anchovies, carp, and sturgeon constantly recur. When bread is charged there is an indignant entry. The inns got dearer as London was approached. At Oxford he found the Angel very dirty and not obliging; the tap of the Mitre appears to have been patronised chiefly by dons. Moritz, the German pedestrian, has left a graphic account of the night he spent there, and of his conversation in Latin with the learned company he found assembled. Moritz was fond of walking, and had not much money to spend, so he resolved to see England on foot. Everywhere he met with ridicule, compassion, or abuse; he found himself walking in a country where no one walked for pleasure. When he resolved to pay the charges of a good hotel he was generally refused admittance; wayside inns shut their doors

upon him too. Great was his delight when he heard himself called "Sir," not "Master," and on rare occasions he found good cheap quarters, paying only a shilling for supper, bed, and breakfast, and fourpence for service. Beer made him very ill, but he found it absolutely necessary to drink healths everywhere if he hoped to obtain the host's good will. Writing of London, he complains of the half-boiled or half-roasted meat, of the cabbage-leaves boiled in plain water, of the sameness of the vegetables, for there are no hotbeds except at the country seats of gentlemen. The world was waiting for Dr. Johnson's cookery-book "on philosophical principles," and meanwhile used Mrs. Hannah Glasse or one of the many new publications issued about the middle of the century, some by ladies, others by the French cooks of noblemen. In the food of the poor the difference between north and south was especially striking. Southerners ate nothing but bread and cheese, and, perhaps, once a week meat baked at the baker's. In the north, soups and many preparations of oats and of potatoes were eaten, and, fuel being cheaper, more scope was allowed to cookery. The prices of food varied from county to county, but an average price for bread was 2d. a pound; butter, 6d.; beef and mutton, 4d.; and cheese, 3½d. In London bread was 2½d. to 3d. in 1782; butter, 11d.; beef, 8d. Milk was 3½d. a quart; sugar, 1s. a pound.

Hours of Meals.

In fashionable circles the dinner hour was five. The Court attendants dined then, had coffee handed afterwards, tea served in the eating-room at eight, and supper at eleven. The king dined at two the queen and princesses at four, and the middle class at three. Breakfast was a light meal, only thin bread-and-butter and toast were eaten. Breakfast parties began to be given at midday at Ranelagh and in private houses, when it was matter for surprise that fish, cold chicken and ham, and other solids should be eaten. The Universities alone clung to the old fashion. In 1752 the Oxford dinner hour was reluctantly advanced from twelve to one.

Drinks.

All classes drank tea; even the poorest had it at least once a day. In 1741 about 750,000 pounds were entered, and paid the tax of 5s. a pound, but what the poor drank was smuggled stuff, often of very poor quality. In 1745 a great reduction in the tax on tea

nearly stopped the contraband trade; but the policy was reversed, the tax increased, and tea was run everywhere. In 1795 the customs on spirits gave a return of about £31,000 on rum, half as much on Geneva (gin) and brandy; the Portuguese wines paid £430,000; the Spanish followed with £87,500; French wines and Madeira paid about £10,000 each; Canary and Rhenish, £1,000 each. By the Eden Treaty Pitt reduced the duties on French wines, and in six years the consumption rose from 100,000 gallons to 683,000; but when the war broke out these wines were again heavily taxed, and the consumption declined.

Smuggling.

The commodities most smuggled were tea, coffee, tobacco; French wines, rum, and brandy, which in 1735 were paying duty at £1 per gallon; muslins from the West Indies, lace, linens, cambrics from France. The "free-trader" was repaid if he saved one cargo out of three; and if the reports of Parliamentary Commissions do not exaggerate, he frequently saved all, and built fine country houses out of the proceeds. The smugglers, armed in bands of from fifty to a hundred, loaded waggons and pack-horses on the open beach, and met with no opposition from the customs officers. In six months 1,835 horse-loads of tea and 1,689 of wet and dry goods were landed on the Suffolk coast, and were removed by armed convoys of smugglers. About 2,000 hogsheads of spirit were run annually on the coast of Hants, Dorset, and Devon, and it took the customs officers nine years to capture as many. "The great store-house of all high-duty goods" was the Isle of Man, whence the goods were despatched in large wherries, which generally outsailed the custom-house sloops, to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland.

Violence.

Even Adam Smith confessed to a weakness for smuggling, and nobody was above bargaining to have a pipe or a hogshead "put in his cellar" at a low figure. But smuggling on a large scale was not carried on without bribery, perjury, informing, violence and murder. The deeds of the Hawkhurst gang in 1748 exceeded all others in brutality. One of their cargoes of tea had been captured and taken to Poole custom-house, and, in a night attack, the leader of the gang, Thomas Kingsmill, recovered it. It became known that a customs officer, Galley, and a shoemaker, Chater,

would give evidence identifying the offenders. They were thereupon caught by the gang, tied to one horse, and flogged till they fell under it. Galley died under the lash; Chater did not, so his eyes and nose were cut out, and he was made to walk noosed into a well that he might hang himself.

Police.

Crimes of violence throughout the first half of the eighteenth century were believed at the time to be dangerously on the increase. Smollett says that "thieves and robbers were now become more desperate and savage than they had ever appeared since mankind was civilised." The law itself set the example if human life and suffering were held cheap, but to us it now appears that the law had not kept pace with the development of society. Not till 1783 was the procession to Tyburn abolished, and the drop used to hasten death by hanging. Johnson, it is true, was angry at these changes, and thought that the "age was running mad after innovation"; but the majority agreed with Horace Walpole that the country was little better than a shambles, and that a change was needed.

Although the capture of MacLean relieved some anxious minds, everywhere it was the feeling that "his profession was no joke." No doubt the London police, before Fielding set his reforms on foot in 1750, were inefficient, and 2,000 watchmen and patrols, "aged in general, often feeble and half-starved on the small pay they received," could not protect all London properly; but though the streets at night were unsafe, houses were safe as they had not been before. By the use of paid informers Fielding broke up one of the worst gangs of street robbers, and in 1757 the nuisance was said to be entirely suppressed. But the roads in the suburbs were not yet safe. In 1781 Sir Horace Walpole, when driving with a lady to an evening party at Twickenham, was attacked by a highwayman. The lady had presence of mind enough to hand him a purse containing nothing but bad money, which she carried with her for use on these occasions.

Newspapers.

The popular outcry about the increase of crime was, to a large extent, the work of news-writers. In spite of the Stamp Act, the sale of newspapers steadily increased, till the number of stamps issued to newspapers amounted in 1753 to 7,411,757, for a population estimated at about 6,200,000. The news-writer—

Johnson's "man without virtue who writes lies at home for his own profit"—could control and guide public opinion, not only in London, but in every provincial town with its own Mercury. The "folio of four pages" contained many advertisements, a small amount of gossip, much ridicule of fashionable life, and some poetry; often no reviews of books or leading articles. It depended generally for its intellectual side on the letters of correspondents.

The *Gentleman's Magazine*, started by Edward Cave, a printer, in 1731, was intended to collect within its pages the essays and intelligence contained in the four hundred sheets which the London and provincial press threw off monthly. In 1732 there were added reports of parliamentary debates, giving the initials and finals only of the names of the speakers. But in 1738 the Commons passed a resolution of "high indignation" against all reporters of their proceedings, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, with its rival, the *London Magazine*, had to make the debates appear imaginary.

Publication of Parliamentary Debates.

The weakness of the Bute ministry made it possible for Wilkes to publish libellous attacks on the government, which appeared in the *North Briton*, so called in opposition to Lord Bute's paper, the *Briton*, worked by Smollett. The failure of Lord Grenville's prosecution of Wilkes, though it turned on another issue, encouraged writers to bolder expressions of opinion. In 1767 the Letters of Junius began to appear in a leading daily paper, Woodfall's *Public Advertiser*, and in 1771, at Wilkes's instigation, the question of the publication of debates was brought to a head. Several London journals agreed to print notes of the speeches with the speakers' names. Thereupon Colonel Onslow, the "little cocking George, the paltry, insignificant insect" of the reporters, who had made the subject his speciality, complained to the House of the printers. Some of the printers refused to obey the order of the House to attend at the bar; a proclamation for their capture was issued, and Wilkes took advantage of this to arrange a conflict between the City authorities and the House. A recalcitrant printer was apprehended according to the order of the proclamation by a friend acting in collusion, and the two came before Wilkes himself as a City alderman. He discharged the prisoner, and arranged that a

countercharge for false imprisonment should be brought against the friend. The Lord Mayor and one of the aldermen concerned were ordered as members of the House to attend in their places. They went, accompanied by crowds of enthusiastic supporters, made their defence against the charge of breach of privilege, and were committed to the Tower. From this time the publication of debates was still technically a breach of privilege, but after one more contest reporting was tacitly allowed. There was, however, no separate accommodation for reporters, note-taking was still prohibited, and the Strangers' Gallery was repeatedly closed.

Opposition to Reform.

The development of journalism aided the spread of information amongst all classes, but there were party ends to serve, and alarms were easy to raise. Never at any time was the country more subject to senseless scares and crazes than in the prosy middle of the eighteenth century. The very placidity of the social atmosphere seemed to make small reforms loom large and fearful. Walpole's ministry was nearly wrecked by his sensible excise proposal, which was ultimately quietly adopted (pp. 121, 367). Pelham's ministry raised a storm of opposition by proposing to reform the Calendar, to prevent clandestine marriage, and to allow Jews to prefer bills of naturalisation. The last measure was repealed in the following session (p. 174). But the House accepted Chesterfield's Bill without opposition, not foreseeing what the popular feeling would be.

Reform of the Calendar.

The Julian Calendar, accepted in England, was founded on the erroneous supposition that the year consists of 365 days and six hours, that being eleven minutes in excess of the mean solar year, and the estimate of the lunations was also inaccurate. The errors had been fully worked out by the fifteenth century, but it was not till Gregory XIII. was Pope that the Julian Calendar was corrected to the Gregorian or new style in all Roman Catholic countries.

In 1751 the Julian first of the month was the Gregorian twelfth. The Bill proposed to accept the new style with the Gregorian method for suppressing the intercalated days. Lord Macclesfield, afterwards President of the Royal Society, helped Lord Chesterfield to prepare the Bill, which was carefully arranged to save as far as possible all confusion in

payments due on fixed days in the year. Eleven days between Wednesday, the 2nd, and Thursday, the 14th of September, were suppressed. The further confusion between the legal year, beginning March 25th, and the calendar year was also rectified. The legal year was made to begin on January 1st, and the Government quarter-days were fixed accordingly. The calculations were made by the Astronomer Royal, Dr. Bradley, who died ten years later, at the age of seventy, of a lingering illness, the nature of which was somewhat obscure. The common people believed it was a judgment of Heaven for his impious proposal to change the days on which the saints had their festivals.

Marriage Act.

The practical details of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act, 1753, were not so skilfully planned as those of Chesterfield's Act for the Reform of the Calendar, but popular opposition was excited more against the principle of public marriage than against those clauses of the Bill which were needlessly severe. Even in 1768 Miss Burney wrote: "A public wedding! Oh! what a *gauntlet* for any woman of delicacy to run! Everybody spoke against a public wedding as the most shocking thing in the world." The Act required that all marriages should take place in a parish church after the banns had been published for three successive Sundays. The archbishop alone could grant licences exempting from this rule, but he might not grant them to minors without the consent of the parent or guardian. The Act fell hardly on the Nonconformists, whose ministers might not perform the marriage ceremony, but it continued in force till the present century.

The Court.

So uncertain was the drift of popular opinion, and so fierce was the spirit of opposition when once excited, that the influences which controlled fashion in the first period of George III.'s reign are hard to detect. The influence of the Court fluctuated, and rarely was of more than secondary importance in determining the current of social feeling. George III.'s popularity now waxed, now waned, so that he seldom knew whether to be prepared for an assassin or for an ovation when he appeared in public. The total change in the moral tone of the inner circle at Court, which was due to the king and queen's love of domesticity, had not the far-reaching effects that might have

been expected. The change had an influence on the middle classes, but not on the upper classes, or on the outer circle of the Court. From the time of the queen's marriage, in her seventeenth year, it was found that she hated "the manners of the times and all our fashionable crimes." But she had little power to make virtue prepossessing. When she had held her drawing-room twice a week and given a State ball twice a year she felt she had done her work; accordingly, the world of fashion voted attendance at Court a tiresome duty. The king and queen were frigid and formal in public, and stood much on their dignity; their warm-heartedness was known only to a few of their private friends, not even to all their own children. Hence they had no power to set the fashion; they could make definite enactments against abuses, but could not stop them. They forbade gambling in the royal palaces, but the gambling mania went on, and, in 1786, Walpole writes: "Even the loss of £100,000 is not rare enough to be surprising."

Men's Dress.

The king and queen liked quiet dress, but it was their eldest son and the Opposition that set the fashion. The "macaronis," led by Fox, were imitated at more or less distance by all who affected the "ton." About 1772 a rage for eccentricity led men to seek variety of cut and ornament in their dress, but the main features did not change till the next period. The macaronis and "jessamies" tried a waistcoat reaching only to the waist, but the long waistcoat held its own. In the material and trimming of the wide-skirted, wide-cuffed coat there was scope for variety. "What! did he address you in a coat not worth looking at? What a shabby wretch!" says Evelina's partner at a dance, when she refuses to identify a certain gentleman. Men's clothes were noticed as much as women's, and correspondence on the subject has been preserved. Walpole writes to a friend, in 1761: "I have chosen your coat, a claret colour, but I have fixed nothing about the lace," for he could not determine rashly. He enters into the respective merits of real lace at 20s. a yard, of wide and narrow gauze-lace, of the second order of gauze-lace, tarnished stuff, which he declares is mere frippery and out of fashion.

In 1765 peruke-makers were noticing with some agitation that men of fashion were beginning to wear their own hair.

The citizen still wore his scratch-wig, untoupéd, with rows of little curls round the neck, but fashionable men let their own hair grow long, tied it in a pig-tail, drew it up in a high toupé over the forehead, and made two rolls of curls or "clubs" on each side of the face. With the pig-tail was worn the "solitaire," a piece of black ribbon tied round the throat and fastened at the back of the neck.

Women's Dress.

Women were wearing a singular combination of the saque and the hoop; the upper garment was open in front, and flowed loosely from the shoulders, whence it trailed behind, or was gathered up in the wearer's hand, displaying the bulging lines of the hoop-petticoat, encircled with furbelows, puffings, or rigid geometrical ornament. The sleeves of the tight bodice reached to the elbow, whence dangled fringe or lace. Out of doors the "Joseph," or long coat, had superseded the "manteau." In 1744, when hoops were enormous, women's heads were dressed to appear phenomenally small. A little close-fitting cap was worn, and if the lady was dressed in "the milk-maid taste," then esteemed "tonnish," a little straw-hat. A reaction set in, and by 1767 enormous structures of horsehair began to be worn, powdered with a mixture of pomatum and meal. In 1776-83 there were "heads" or "pompons" a yard high, upon which were displayed ribbons, lace, butterflies in spun-glass—even, it is recorded, a sow with a litter of pigs. In front was stuck a tall ostrich-feather, curling forwards. The queen forbade "plume-headed" ladies to appear at Court, but without avail. Her own daughters wore plumes, and later, as the "head" diminished, the number of plumes increased to three. The "head," once dressed by the hairdresser, was not to be taken down for a mere whim; and ladies were suspected of sleeping in them for many successive nights. In the daytime the whole erection was tied up in a "mob," a "fly-cap" *à la Thérèse*, or in the "Ranelagh mob" of "gauze minionett." The ends of the gauze were crossed under the chin, and fastened at the back of the head, after the fashion then prevailing among Covent Garden market women, who had, however, less hair to cover.

The years 1760-85 were characterised by a marked improvement in the position of women with intellectual and social abilities. Their interests were no longer confined

to amusements, domestic economy and dress. It was in 1750 that Mrs. Montagu (p. 152; in her unmarried days Elizabeth Robinson, the friend of Mrs. Delany and of the Duchess of Portland) began to attempt a reform of manners by having parties "where cards could not be thought of," evening assemblies "where the fair sex might participate in conversation with literary and ingenious men." In 1757 the word "blue-stocking," as applied to those who attended such parties, first occurs in her letters. Benjamin Stillingfleet came in morning dress, wearing his grey worsted stockings and not the black silk required in evening dress. Admiral Boscawen applied the term "blue-stocking" to the whole society with its original contemptuous meaning. The society accepted it, declaring that without Stillingfleet's blue stockings their parties were never complete. From 1770-85 the "blues" were in their heyday. Mrs. Montagu was esteemed by Wraxall the Madame du Deffand of the English capital, and he describes the *gens de lettres*, or Blue-stockings, as "a very numerous, powerful, compact phalanx in the midst of London." Mrs. Vesey, another clever hostess, made it her object to break up the formal "circle" which had long been fashionable at literary parties. She would have no holding-forth, no reading aloud of new works, and set all the chairs in groups of three, to the great amusement of Miss Burney. Mrs. Chapone made up for her want of personal charm by her "most superiorly unaffected nature," but her parties were too bookish for Miss Burney's taste, who thought that "a little rattling would prodigiously mend matters." To this group belonged nearly all the lady authors—Hannah More; Elizabeth Carter, who translated Epictetus; Hannah Cowley, author of the "Belle's Stratagem"; Mrs. Thrale, and, of course, Frances Burney. Aristocratic ladies and famous beauties were also proud to belong to the circle where Horace Walpole and Dr. Johnson and Edmund Burke might be heard talking their best. The death of Dr. Johnson was a blow from which the circle never recovered; in 1785 the originators of the movement were getting old women; they had done their work and smoothed the way for the younger generation. Time was when intelligence in a woman was only considered pardonable when accompanied by remarkable beauty or personal charm. It was now no longer

The Blue Stockings.

necessary to join the Blues to reap the benefit of that particular natural gift; it was acceptable everywhere.

J. COLVILLE. Scotland.

THE Jacobite episode is one of the best and most widely known in Scottish annals. It has enriched the national literature with the picturesque features of romance, while art and music have not yet exhausted its sources of humour and pathos. Issuing from the solitudes of Lochaber, the rising of '45 swept across the peace-loving Lowlands with the rapidity of a Border foray. Perth, Stirling, Edinburgh, were passed in quick succession; the feeble garrison of dragoons, to whom an ill-informed Government had left the post of danger, fled from the stubble-fields of Prestonpans before the gleam of the claymore; and the clansmen crowded in easy triumph through the gates of Carlisle. But the hopeless march into the Midlands served only to show that centuries separated the Southron from the social forces of clan life. Aliens in speech and garb, the clansmen inspired terror instead of confidence. Long before Derby was reached retreat became a necessity, and, though the journey hillwards again was lightened by the brilliant discomfiture of Hawley at Falkirk, the desperate close on Culloden Moor (1746; p. 192) was inevitable. The rash prince, skulking from the toils and evading capture only by extreme privations, was made to suffer bitterly but not undeservedly for an enterprise which, if we remember that a generation did not suffice to efface its deadly hurts, was nothing short of criminal. Charles Edward Stuart, for whom the Jacobites had done and suffered so much, ended an inglorious career not unfittingly in 1789 on the eve of that French Revolution which was so soon to make such havoc of the "divinity that doth hedge a king."

The '45.

Consequences of the '45.

The solution of the problem, how to convert Scotland from a source of danger to one of safety to the realm, formed a new departure in English politics and taught the value of remedial legislation. For a while, however, it looked as if the old methods were to prevail in the hands of the sanguinary Cumberland, who wrote, a few days after Culloden, "If we had destroyed every man, such is the soil, rebellion would sprout

again should a new system of government not be found out." Stern repression was, however, for a time the order of the day. An Act against Episcopacy imposed many vexatious disabilities on the nonjuring clergy. A Disarming Act punished a first offence with a heavy fine and six months in prison, and a second with seven years' transportation, while it struck at clan sentiment by similar penalties for wearing the tartan in kilt or plaid. But Chancellor Hardwicke's Bill for abolishing heritable jurisdictions (1747) helped largely to adapt the social life of Scotland to modern conditions. The Crown had of old divested itself of nearly all the functions of local justice in favour of the barons, thus giving rise to a system of lucrative fines in the hands of hereditary sheriffs. The compensation of £152,000 consoled the territorial magnates for the loss of feudal power, and aided in that improvement of estates which so greatly helped the material progress of the century. Following upon the abolition of the Lords of the Articles (1690; IV., p. 609), this Act completed the de-feudalising process. Along with this measure President Forbes secured another equally statesmanlike. This was to vest in the Crown the Forfeited Estates, collect the rents through factors, and use the proceeds for the permanent improvement of the Highlands. For some years after the date of this Commission (1752) judicial rents were strictly enforced and evictions carried out with military aid. There was, however, a singular absence of agrarian crime, save the case of the shooting of Campbell of Glenure, so picturesquely treated in Stevenson's "Kidnapped." The recruiting of Highland regiments for foreign service turned the warlike sentiments of both chiefs and clansmen into the most effective aids in the expansion of the empire. Deported Highlanders settled down as excellent colonists, while retired officers turned their savings to the best account in the improvement of estates. From the peace of 1763 we date, indeed, the first start in material prosperity, and this, coupled with the Montgomery Act (1770), modifying entails, and the repeal of the Disarming Act (1784), effectually salved the sores of the '45.

For thirty years following the '45 Scotland gave no serious trouble. The war policy of Chatham and North made the country only too well acquainted with the horrors of the

pressgang. This and the smuggling, born of an unwise fiscal system, formed a frequent source of local disturbance. Thurot's futile landing in the Isle of Man (1755) was the first threat of French invasion and led to the Militia Bill (1757; p. 174). Its extension to Scotland was keenly supported (1760), but the Government hesitated to arm a country so recently in rebellion. Not till 1793 was Scotland trusted with a share in the national defence.

Government.

Meantime a strong party looked upon the rejection of the measure as an insult. Out of this offended national sentiment arose the Poker Club in Edinburgh, of whose early days Dr. Alexander Carlyle has so much to say. It was notable as the first stirring of healthy public feeling. Less justifiable excitement arose over the Catholic Relief Bill (1778; p. 179), giving expression as it did to prejudices which were nowhere stronger than in Scotland.

Militia Bill.

Catholic Relief.

In the Irish Parliament there were all along two leading parties. The Court party included the chief officials, from the Lord-Lieutenant down, nearly all Englishmen, and all in the English interest. Taking their orders from the other side, they passed, or endeavoured to pass, every measure suggested to them from England. But there was always a determined Opposition, generally small—the "Patriots," or "Patriotic Party," as they came to be called—who were for independent action, and resisted all dictation; and they were supported by some very able and brilliant men from the outside. The leading feature in the political history of Ireland during the period comprised in this chapter was the struggle of the Patriotic Party for free trade and legislative independence, which eventuated in Grattan's Parliament of 1782. It is necessary to bear in mind that this long and bitter struggle was maintained exclusively by Protestants. The Catholics, forming four-fifths of the population, had no franchise, no representation, no political existence; so that they were absolutely shut out from taking any part in these spirit-stirring contests. The laws against them, indeed, appear to have been too much for

P. W. JOYCE. Ireland.

Two Parliamentary Parties.

human nature, either to enforce stringently on the one hand, or to bear on the other; and the cruel intentions of the legislators were, all along, to some extent frustrated by the good feeling and compassion of the general body of Protestants.

The contest of the two Parliamentary parties went on incessantly; the Patriots were sleepless and active, and gained strength from year to year; a spirit of independence gradually spread abroad; and the people began to have some confidence in the power of Parliament to do good. There was now no longer any desire for legislative union with England (p. 168); on the contrary, when, in 1759, it was rumoured that union was in contemplation, there was a terrible riot in Dublin.

Secret Societies.

The oppression of the peasantry by the local gentry—who were always backed by the law—added greatly to the misery arising from loss of trade. They charged exorbitant rents; enclosed as their private property the commons which belonged, from old times, to the people; and in some parts of the country they forced the farmers and labourers to work without pay at making and repairing roads, giving no help themselves. The people, driven at last to desperation—Catholics and Protestants, north and south—formed themselves into secret oathbound societies to redress their grievances by force. There were Whiteboys in the south, who were joined by both Catholics and Protestants; among the Protestants of the north there were "Steel-boys" and "Hearts of Oak;" and among Catholics "Defenders." These societies, passing beyond their original functions, did great mischief, and sometimes committed terrible cruelties.

Emigration of Presbyterians.

More than half a century before this time the Presbyterians of Ulster had begun to emigrate in great numbers to New England, driven from the country partly by want of employment after the suppression of the wool trade (IV., p. 621), and partly by the religious persecution they endured under the Test and Schism Acts. This emigration still continued; and though the English Government were much troubled at the loss of the very flower of the Ulster Protestants, and at the resulting relative increase of the Catholics, they obstinately refused to repeal the objectionable statutes, even in face of the earnest recommendations of successive Lord-Lieutenants. When, subsequently, the American war broke out, the most

determined and dangerous of the troops who fought under Washington against England were the sturdy expatriated Presbyterians and the sons and grandsons of the older Puritan colonists.

The American war had a most important influence on the affairs of Ireland. Nearly all the troops had to be withdrawn, and the country was left unprotected at the very time when American privateers were doing much damage round the Irish coasts and a foreign invasion on a large scale was feared. The Irish saw that, if they were to be protected at all, they must protect themselves; and for this purpose they began to enroll themselves as Volunteers. The movement originated in Belfast in 1779 and spread rapidly; and companies were formed in the four provinces, till ultimately they numbered 100,000 men, with Lord Charlemont as commander-in-chief. Their sympathies were entirely with the Patriots—indeed, the movement was initiated by that party, and accordingly the Government viewed it with suspicion and disfavour; but the feeling of the country was so strong that they were forced to acquiesce. They even went so far as to supply arms, though sorely against their will; but uniforms and all other expenses were supplied by the people. This was an exclusively Protestant movement, the Catholics not yet being permitted to take any positions of trust.

The Volunteers.

The Patriotic Party in Parliament were at this time led by two great men—Henry Grattan and Henry Flood. With the Volunteers at their back the party now gained more confidence than ever. On the assembling of Parliament in 1779, Grattan, in an amendment to the Address, demanded free trade, and the following motion was carried:—"That it is not by temporary expedients, but by a free trade alone, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin." The motion was supported by all Ireland; and the Government, with the American war going against them, and France and Spain hostile, could no longer resist the concession of justice. It belonged, however, to the English Parliament, who had imposed the restraints, to remove them; and in 1779 Lord North had certain propositions passed, which permitted the free export of woollen and other manufactures from Ireland, and allowed free trade

Free Trade.

with the colonies. Thus was Irish trade relieved from its worst restrictions. But the mischief had been done; the main industries had been crushed beyond recovery; and to this day Ireland suffers the evil consequences, in the general absence of manufactures and commerce, and in the resulting undue competition for land.

Under the pressure of the American war, some of the worst provisions of the laws against Catholics were also removed (p. 174). In 1778 the law which gave the whole property to the eldest son who became a Protestant was repealed; and the Catholics also obtained the right to lease land for 999 years. Soon afterwards the Test Act (IV., p. 620) was repealed, which was a relief to Dissenters as well as to Catholics.

Grattan's Parliament.

The ideas of the Popular Party grew with their success, and they now resolved that their Parliament should be free. This, however, they found a harder task. In 1780 Grattan moved that the king, with the Lords and Commons of Ireland, are the only power on earth competent to enact laws to bind Ireland. But the Government were able, by the usual corrupt agencies, to secure a majority against him. Grattan next determined to make the Volunteers heard; and under the management of Lord Charlemont, Flood, and himself, a meeting of 242 delegates from 143 Volunteer Corps of Ulster was held in Dungannon on the 15th February, 1782, where decisive resolutions were passed in favour of legislative independence and a perfectly free and open trade. These resolutions were adopted by all the Volunteer Corps of Ireland. At the same time a further measure of relief for Catholics was passed in the Irish Parliament, permitting them to buy and sell land, and to open schools; and, among other measures, the law prohibiting a Catholic from having a horse worth more than £5 was repealed.

Parliament met in Dublin on the 16th April, 1782, when Grattan moved, in an amendment to the Address, the substance of the Dungannon resolutions. The Government party saw that further opposition was useless, and might be dangerous, and the amendment was unanimously agreed to. This was immediately followed, in the English Parliament, by a repeal of the Sixth of George I. (p. 168). This "Act of Repeal," as it was called, was generally understood to

include the repeal of Poynings' Law; and it was shortly afterwards followed by the "Act of Renunciation," declaring that Ireland's right to make her own laws was fully established, and was never again to be questioned. This completed the freedom of the Irish Parliament.

AUTHORITIES.—1742-1784.

GENERAL HISTORY.

Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century;* Lord Mahon, *History of England since the Peace of Utrecht;* Erskine May, *Constitutional History;* Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* These biographies are most useful:—Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne;* Albemarle, *Rockingham and his Contemporaries;* Longman, *Frederick the Great;* Macaulay, *Essays* on Chatham, Pitt, Warren Hastings, Clive, and Frederick the Great. Original Authorities.—Hervey, *Memoirs of George II.;* Horace Walpole, *Memoirs and Letters to Sir Horace Mann; Letters of Junius; Correspondence of George III. and Lord North;* Burke, *Thoughts on the Present Discontent,* and *Speeches on America;* Rockingham, *Memoirs;* Emily Osborne, *Political and Social Letters of a Lady of the Eighteenth Century; The Bedford Correspondence; Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury; The Grenville Papers.*

SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

Military History, as in c. xvii. *The Navy* and *Exploration, see* lists following c. xix.

Nonconformity and the Wesleyan Movement, 1714-1815.—*History of the Dissenting Deputies* (1813); *Test Act Reporter* (1829); *Parliamentary Return* of Dissenters' Places of Worship registered between 1688 and 1852 (1853, No. 156); Dr. Stoughton, *Religion under Queen Anne and the Georges;* Skeats, *History of the Free Churches;* Waddington, *Congregational History,* 1700-1800; Dr. Halley, *Lancashire: Its Puritanism and Nonconformity;* Tyerman, *Life of John Wesley;* Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism.*

Literature, 1715-1784.—Grose, *History of Eighteenth Century Literature;* Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century;* Thackeray, *English Humourists;* Hazlitt, *English Poets and Comic Writers;* Elwin and Courthope's edition of Pope; Boswell, *Life of Johnson,* with the notes of its various commentators.

Art, 1715-1815.—Austin Dobson, *Hogarth* (contains a bibliography); Leslie and Taylor, *Life of Reynolds:* also—works on Reynolds by Northcote, Claude Phillips, and Pulling; on Gainsborough, by Fletcher and Brock-Arnold; Hilda Gamlin, *George Romney;* the historical notes by F. G. Stephens to the catalogues of the "Reynolds and Gainsborough," and the "Century of English Art" Exhibitions; Gilchrist, *Life of Blake;* Wright, *History of Caricature and Grotesque;* Grego, *Rowlandson, the Caricaturist,* and *The Works of James Gillray, the Caricaturist;* Cunningham, *Lives of Painters and Sculptors;* articles in *Dictionary of National Biography;* R. and S. Redgrave, *A Century of Painters;* E. Chesneau, *La Peinture Anglaise;* Cook, *Handbook to the National Gallery;* F. Wedmore, *Studies in English Art;* F. H. Ward, *English Art in the Public Galleries.*

Science and Philosophy and *Agriculture* as in c. xvii.

Manufactures.—The authorities cited in c. xvii.; also—*Cotton:* Histories of the Cotton Manufacture, by E. Baines and R. Guest; F. Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies;* Woodcroft, *Inventors of Machines for the Manufacture of Textile Fabrics;* French, *Life and Times of Crompton. The Steam Engine:* Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers* and lives of Boulton and of Watt; R. H. Thurston, *History of the Steam*

Engine; Farey, *Treatise on the Steam Engine. Coal-mining and Smelting with Coke: Dict. Nat. Biography*, article "Darby"; J. Percy, *Iron and Steel;* Roscoe and Schorlemmer, *Chemistry: A Treatise on Coal Mining* (1769). *Ceramics:* Meteyard, *Life of Josiah Wedgewood;* L. Jewett, *Lives of the Wedgewoods* and *Ceramic Art;* Prideaux, *Relics of Cookworthy.* On the whole period, *see* Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce. Canals.*—Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers*; Philips, *Inland Navigation.*

Finance.—*See* list following c. xix.

Pauperism, Labour, etc.—Besides the ordinary histories and memoirs, the most useful books are—Eden, *State of the Poor;* Burn, *The Poor Laws* (1764); Aschrott, *The English Poor Law System;* Fowle, *The English Poor Law*, "Citizen" series; the *Parliamentary History;* the Commons *Journals* (especially 1773 and 1778-79); Dr. John Brown, *Estimate, etc.* (1757); also particularly Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, and Arthur Young's *Tours*, and among modern books, S. and B. Webb, *Trade Unions;* Brentano on *Guilds;* Howell, *Capital and Labour;* Pike, *History of Crime;* W. C. Sydney, *England in the Eighteenth Century;* Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce;* Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages.*

Social Life, Manners, Costume, etc., 1742-1815.—*General:* Various works by W. Andrews, *e.g. Byegone England, Byegone Derbyshire, Byegone Yorkshire*, etc.; Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, i.-vi.; Miss Berry, *Social Condition of England and France;* Stone, *Chronicles of Fashion;* Browne, *Estimate* (1758); Wale, *My Grandfather's Pocket-book*, 1701-96 (London, 1883); Miss Martineau, *History of the Peace;* Oliphant, *Historical Sketches.* Collections: *e.g.* Ashton, *Old Times, Dawn of the Nineteenth Century in England, English Caricature and Napoleon I.; Annual Register;* Gomme, *Gentleman's Magazine Library;* Place, *MS. Collections* (Add. MSS. 27,827). Letters: *On the Present State of England* (1772), of the Countess of Suffolk (ed. Croker), of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford (ed. Cunningham), of Lady Hervey (ed. Croker), of Lord Chesterfield, of Mrs. Montague, of Maria Edgeworth (ed. Hare). Lives—of Chesterfield, by Maty; of Fielding, by Lawrence; of Hogarth, by Nichols; of Mrs. Carter, by Pennington; of the Countess of Huntingdon; of Mrs. Chapone; and of Wilberforce; Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Birkbeck Hill. Diaries: *e.g.* of Miss Burney (Madame D'Arblay); Wesley, *Journal* (4 vols. London, 1827). Memoirs: *e.g.* Sir Lascelles Wraxall, Tate Wilkinson (4 vols. York, 1790). Reminiscences: *e.g.* Angelo, Miller, *Retrospect:* Mozley, *Village Life. Special Topics* (arranged alphabetically).—*Coaching:* Malet, *Annals of the Road;* Thrupp, *History of Coaches. Commerce:* McCulloch, *Account of the British Empire;* Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce;* Craik, *History of British Commerce; Cookery:* Books by Mrs. Glasse, B. Clermont, Mrs. Randall. *Country Clergy:* Twining, R., *The Recreations and Studies of a Country Clergyman in the Eighteenth Century*, and other works; Goldsmith, *Vicar of Wakefield. The Court:* J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Court of England to the Death of George II.*, and also *of George III.;* Walpole, *Letters; Lord Hervey's Correspondence;* Thackeray, *The Four Georges. Dress:* Fairholt, Ashton (works cited above); Sangster, *Umbrellas. Fleet Marriages:* by J. Southerden Burns. *Foreigners in England:* Works by Angeloni and Moritz (in Pinkerton's *Collection*, ii.); Sirmond, Duc de Levis, *England at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Journalism:* Grant, *History of the Newspaper Press;* Hunt, *Fourth Estate. Local History:* Roberts, *Southern Counties;* Sutton, *History of Nottingham;* Langford, *A Century of Birmingham Life;* Arthur Young's *Tours. London:* Pennant (1790); Jesse; Maitland; Timbs, *Club Life in London. Novels:* W. Raleigh, *The English Novel* (1894). *Police:* Colquhoun; Fielding, *Increase of Robbers; On the Police of* 1753; Pike, *History of Crime. Smuggling:* Sussex *Archæological Collections*, x.; *Reports* of Parliamentary Committees; Shore, *Smuggling Days and Smuggling Ways.*

Scotland and Ireland.—*See* lists following c. xix.

CHAPTER XIX.

REVOLUTION AND REACTION. 1784—1802.

A. HASSALL. Political History.

THE victory of Pitt at the election of 1784 seemed, at first sight, the decisive event in the great struggle between George III. and the Whigs which had continued since the opening of the reign. There was a general feeling in the country that the House of Commons was becoming as tyrannical as the Stuart Monarchy, and the triumph of George III. was thought by some to prognosticate the ruin of the Whig party.

The Meaning of Pitt's Victory.

The king undoubtedly regarded Pitt as the minister of his choice, and one who would carry out the royal views. In reality, however, the defeat of the Whigs in 1784 was effected by the people, who had full confidence in Pitt. That statesman entirely appreciated the necessity of a close alliance between the king and the mass of his subjects, and by dint of consummate tact he obtained such an influence over George III. that the constitution was in no wise impaired by the apparent triumph of the royal power. During Pitt's tenure of office the ministerial authority was consolidated, Cabinet Government developed naturally, and the attempt of Thurlow to revive the pernicious departmental system, which allowed the existence of independent views on the part of ministers, resulted in his retirement from office in 1792.

Pitt's India Bill and the Trial of Hastings.

Till 1792 Pitt devoted himself to carrying out reforms in all branches of the administration. He turned his attention first to the affairs of India, and in 1784 passed his India Bill, creating a Board of Control, consisting of six members and forming a department of the Government. Though the responsibility for all political affairs was left to the Board, everything pertaining to commerce remained in the hands of the Company. Dundas (p. 500) became the first President of the

Board of Control, which governed India till 1858. In 1788 the trial of Warren Hastings began, and continued till 1792. He was accused of tyranny, malversation, and cruelty, but was acquitted on every point. His trial, however, marks the growing interest taken in Indian affairs, and the Governor-Generalship of Cornwallis (1786-93) saw the beginning of definite attempts to improve the lot of the peasants in Bengal.

In April, 1785, Pitt introduced a Parliamentary Reform Bill, proposing the disfranchisement of many boroughs and the increase of the county constituencies. Burke, Portland, with North and most of his followers, opposed the Bill; while Fox, who approved of the principle of parliamentary reform, disliked the details of the measure. Leave to introduce the Bill was refused by 248 to 174, and during the rest of his life Pitt never supported the efforts of the parliamentary reformers. Nevertheless, he established an audit of the Government accounts, checked jobbery to the utmost of his ability, and from the period of his ascendency may be dated the cessation of direct parliamentary corruption. His abandonment of reform of Parliament did not check in the slightest degree his efforts to cure financial maladministration. He had an extraordinary aptitude for mastering the intricacies of the national finance, which he found in a deplorable condition. A large unfunded debt existed, smuggling had increased to an enormous extent (p. 350), and the deficiency of the year 1784 was not less than three millions. During the early years of his tenure of office Pitt boldly attacked these abuses, and succeeded in placing the finances on a sound basis. By his "Hovering Act" he checked smuggling; in 1786 he adopted the excise scheme which Walpole had failed to carry in 1733, and in various ways he lessened the numberless frauds on the revenue. In 1787 he consolidated the different branches of customs and excise. Like Shelburne, he had imbibed Adam Smith's views about free trade, and though through the short-sighted opposition of the English merchants, supported by Fox and Burke, he was unable in 1785 to carry a measure for equalising the duties of England and Ireland, he succeeded in 1786 in concluding a commercial treaty with France which was the most valuable result of his legislative activity. He next

Parliamentary Reform.

Financial Measures.

adopted measures to reduce the National Debt, which amounted to £250,000,000. He determined to apply a sum of £1,000,000 a year to the redemption of the debt, and till 1807 the system of a sinking fund was steadily pursued (p. 475). By that time it was realised that, though useful in a period of peace, Pitt's scheme had failed during the war against France, when the nation was forced to borrow large sums at high interest and to apply part of them to pay off a debt which bore a low interest. At the time of the Peace of Amiens, in 1802, the National Debt had reached the sum of £574,000,000.

The Slave Trade.

Till the outbreak of the French Revolution and the insurrection in St. Domingo, Pitt urged the abolition of the slave trade. In 1788 he supported a Bill for the better regulation of slave ships, and in 1789 he joined Fox, Burke, and Wilberforce in carrying resolutions condemning the slave trade. Mr. Lecky (V., p. 65) thinks that his speech, in 1792, on the abolition of the traffic "was perhaps the greatest he ever delivered." After 1792, however, Pitt's attitude towards the question changed, and he refused to destroy the slave trade in the French and Dutch colonies conquered by England; English ships were employed, and in consequence the English slave trade more than doubled during Pitt's administration. During the early stages of the French war, the abolitionist movement ceased to rouse any general interest, and it was not till 1804 that Wilberforce renewed the struggle.

The Regency Bill, 1788.

In 1788 the illness of the king threatened to overthrow Pitt. The appointment of the Prince of Wales as Regent with unlimited powers would certainly have been followed by the accession of the Whigs to office. Fox declared that during the incapacity of the king the control of the government of the country devolved upon the Prince of Wales by right; Pitt, on the other hand, asserted that the Prince had no more right to the Regency than any other subject. In the House of Lords, however, the Duke of York, on behalf of the Prince of Wales, announced that

"His Royal Highness understood too well the sacred principles which seated the House of Brunswick on the throne of Great Britain even to assume or exercise any power, be his claim what it might, that was not

derived from the will of the people expressed by their representatives and their lordships in Parliament assembled."

Eventually Pitt brought in a Bill making the Prince Regent with modified powers. But early in 1789, before the Bill was passed, George III. recovered, and till the end of his reign enjoyed great popularity.

Between the King's recovery and the beginning of the great French war, Pitt continued his progressive policy. In 1791, the Quebec Government Act divided Canada into two provinces, and Mitford's Bill removing some of the disabilities of the Roman Catholics was passed, and was followed in 1792 by Fox's Libel Act. Pitt's administration coincided with the most active period of that great industrial revolution which has transformed English society, and effected a considerable change in the distribution of wealth. It was also coincident with a gradual elevation of the standard of religion and morals, the result of the movement inaugurated by Wesley (p. 237). In all directions were to be found life and vigour, and Pitt, basing his power upon the support of the constituencies, formed a new Tory party, which, till the outbreak of the excesses of the French revolution, attempted to carry out an advanced liberal policy.

Summary of Pitt's Administration, 1784–1792.

The first effects of the French Revolution were not, on the whole, prejudicial to liberal legislation. Though the attempts of Beaufoy and Fox to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts failed, and though Pitt, in 1790, refused to support Flood's motion for parliamentary reform on the ground that it was inopportune, it remains true that it was not till 1792 that the panic caused by the French excesses began to interfere seriously with the beneficial legislation which characterised the earlier years of the ministry. Pitt had indeed welcomed the Revolution, hoping that a constitutional Government would be established in France, and saw no reason for alarm. The rapid and disorderly development of the movement, however, arrested the growth of sympathy for the French nation; and Burke, in his "Reflections on the French Revolution," published in November, 1790, exercised a powerful influence upon public opinion, and contributed to the growth of a strong war party in England.

The Effects of the French Revolution.

The deposition of Louis XVI., on August 10th, 1792,

followed by the September massacres, the conquest of Belgium, the opening of the Scheldt, the Decrees of November 19 and December 15, the threatened invasion of Holland, and the execution of the French king, roused great indignation in England, and led to the declaration of war, on February 1st, 1793. With this came a severe crisis (p. 476).

The Period of Reaction.

All schemes of reform were at once suspended; a Bill for the abolition of the slave trade was postponed by the House of Lords, Fox's motion for the removal of certain disabilities of the Dissenters was defeated, and Tom Paine was convicted for seditious writing. Fox's Libel Act remains the only progressive measure passed in 1792. In 1793 the reaction set in apace. A motion, proposed by Mr. Grey, for parliamentary reform was rejected by 294 to 105, while an Alien Act for the supervision, and, if necessary, for the removal of aliens was passed, and was followed by the Traitorous Correspondence Act. In 1794 the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended. Political offences were dealt with in a harsh manner. In 1793, Muir, a Scottish advocate, was transported for having urged parliamentary reform, and Palmer, a clergyman, suffered the same fate for circulating an address (p. 501). In 1794, Horne Tooke, Hardy, and Thelwall, who were tried in England for treason, were acquitted; and from that time the attempts to interfere with personal liberty on frivolous grounds ceased.

The French Revolution had thus produced a revulsion of feeling in the country, and the reaction against a progressive policy continued till about 1822. In 1794 the famous secession of the Duke of Portland, Burke, and many of the old Whigs took place. All liberal legislation ceased, Pitt no longer brought in wise and enlightened measures, but became associated with repressive laws; the Whig party suffered complete shipwreck. Only a minority of its members remained under Fox and Grey, in opposition to Pitt, who, though he had entered the war with France with reluctance, carried it on with vigour, while continuing a repressive policy at home. In 1795, the Treasonable Practices Bill and Seditious Meetings Bill were carried at a time when a reactionary feeling was making itself felt in the country. Pitt himself was anxious for peace, and in 1796 entered into negotiations with the Directory,

which soon broke down. Affairs in England had, indeed, become critical. In 1797 a monetary crisis occurred (p. 476), through a deficiency of gold and silver, caused by the heavy payments to the Allies. To save the finances from falling into confusion, the Government authorised the Bank of England to suspend cash payments, and it was not till 1819 that the Act, which was meant to be a temporary measure, was repealed. In 1798 an income tax of ten per cent. on incomes over £200 was imposed, and the same year Fox and his followers, regarding Pitt's policy as dangerous to liberty, seceded from Parliament. In 1800, the series of repressive measures was completed by the passing of the Corresponding Societies Bill, by which, in the words of Erskine May, "the popular constitution of England was suspended." It was in July of the same year that the Union of Great Britain and Ireland was effected, an event which led to the fall of Pitt.

In 1782 Ireland had secured legislative independence from the Rockingham ministry, and till 1800 was ruled by Grattan's Parliament (p. 505). The insurrection of 1798 convinced Pitt of the necessity of a legislative union between England and Ireland, and in 1800 the Act of Union was passed. Pitt's attempt to remove the Catholic disabilities had been less successful (p. 508). George III. was strongly opposed to Catholic emancipation. The Irish Catholics, on the understanding that Pitt would bring in remedial measures, had not opposed the Act of Union. The Prime Minister's regard for George III., whose health was again causing anxiety, prevented any attempt to carry his supplementary measures through Parliament; and, finding himself in a dilemma, he resigned his office in March, 1800. He was succeeded by Addington, who formed a ministry which included Lord Chancellor Eldon, the Duke of Portland, Lord President of the Council, and Lord Hawkesbury (afterwards Lord Liverpool), Foreign Secretary. During Addington's ministry the first period of the great French war came to an end. Both France and England were desirous of peace, and the Peace of Amiens was signed on March 25th, 1802.

Fall of Pitt.

After the close of the American War England remained till 1788 isolated in Europe. Engrossed in his schemes of

reform, Pitt was content for some years to subordinate the European interests of England to financial and administrative considerations. In 1784, in spite of Vergennes's attempt to secure the co-operation of England, no steps were taken to prevent or protest against the Russian seizure of the Crimea in time of peace; and in 1785 France supported the Dutch in their opposition to Joseph II.'s aggressions, mediated the Treaty of Fontainebleau on November 8th between the Emperor and the Republic, and made a close military and commercial alliance with Holland. A very serious blow had been dealt at the influence of England in Europe, one of her oldest allies had been detached from the English connection, and the supremacy of France in the United Provinces seemed fraught with danger to the balance of power.

England and Europe, 1784-1802.

In Holland the lower orders, following the tradition of centuries, supported William V. the Stadtholder and the English connection, while the wealthy citizens formed the "patriot" party, which advocated a French alliance, relied on the wealth and resources of Holland, and aimed at abolishing the hereditary stadtholdership, or, at any rate, of depriving the Prince of Orange of all real weight in the State. The task of opposing these schemes, of maintaining the English interests, and of resisting the French party, devolved on Sir James Harris, the English minister at the Hague. In September, 1786, the "patriot" party deprived William V. of his command of the army, and the situation became critical. Frederick the Great had refused to aid the Stadtholder, who had married his niece, and had advised him to make no opposition to France; while Pitt was disinclined to pledge the honour of England to support the Orange party, and was averse to risking the chance of going to war.

The Crisis in Holland.

On August 17th, 1786, Frederick the Great died, and his successor being of an adventurous disposition and not unwilling to enter into an alliance with England, Harris wrote to Pitt, pressing hard for active intervention in Holland to prevent the entire subjection of the United Provinces to France. In February, 1787, Vergennes died, and his incompetent

The Triple Alliance, 1788.

successor, Montmorin, found it impossible to continue his predecessor's energetic foreign policy. In May Pitt agreed to advance £20,000 to the Stadtholder. On June 28th the Princess of Orange was insulted by some free corps near Gouda, and on September 19th a Prussian army entered Holland. The Stadtholder was restored to his former position, Montmorin agreed to disarm and not to interfere in the affairs of the United Provinces, while Pitt, who had determined to oppose by force of arms any aggression on the part of the French, signed treaties with Holland and Prussia in April, 1788, and made an alliance with Frederick William II. in June. In this manner was consolidated the Triple Alliance of 1788, which, having for its object the maintenance of the peace of Europe, exercised during the next four years a great influence on Continental affairs. The French policy had been defeated, English influence had been restored in Holland, the hereditary stadtholdership was guaranteed to the House of Orange, and Sir James Harris was created Lord Malmesbury as a reward for his services.

The Outbreak of the Turkish War, 1787.

Before the completion of the Triple Alliance Turkey had, in August, 1787, declared war upon Russia, and in February, 1788, Joseph II. came to the aid of the Tsarina and attacked the Porte. The Russians met with signal successes, defeating the Turkish fleet and capturing Ochákov in December, 1788; but the Austrians suffered reverses, and Joseph II., before the end of the year, returned to Vienna ill and discouraged. Till the outbreak of the Turkish war, friendship with Russia had been one of the traditions of the English Foreign Office. The attempt, however, of the two Imperial Powers to partition the dominions of the Porte roused the alarm of Pitt, and since his ministry, England has shown a lively interest in the relations of Russia and Turkey.

Sweden and Europe.

In the summer of 1788 Gustavus III. of Sweden, taking advantage of the Eastern war, invaded Finland, and threatened St. Petersburg with an attack. This unexpected invasion of Russia furnished a valuable diversion in favour of the Turks, and alarm was felt in the Russian capital. But the Russian

fleet, after an engagement, shut up the Swedish ships in the harbour of Sveaborg, while a mutiny of the officers in Finland paralysed the operations of Gustavus III., who further found himself exposed to an attack by Denmark. In September, 1788, a Danish army had invaded Sweden, and the independence of that country was seriously threatened. The members of the Triple Alliance at once took action to prevent the Baltic from becoming a Russian lake. The Danes, at the threat of English and Prussian intervention, signed an armistice with Sweden in October, 1788. The political balance in the Baltic was restored; Russian interests had suffered a serious blow; the independence of Sweden was assured; and these results were not a little due to the skill and energy of Hugh Elliot, the English minister at Copenhagen. Russia was furious at the conduct of England, refused the mediation of the Allies, attempted to form a Quadruple Alliance with Austria, France, and Spain, and continued the war with Turkey and Sweden. The next great task of England and her Allies was to bring about the pacification of Europe by means of a separate peace between the Emperor and the Porte. Though the operations of Austria against Turkey were, in 1789, successful, grave discontent existed in the Austrian Netherlands, in Hungary, and in Bohemia; and in January, 1790, the Austrian garrison having been completely driven out, an Act of Union of the Belgian United Provinces was drawn up. On the subject of mediation between Austria and Turkey that unanimity which had existed among the Allies with regard to the Danish invasion of Sweden was wanting. The King of Prussia wished to take advantage of the difficulties in which Austria found herself to acquire Danzig and Thorn, and to recognise and support the independence of the Austrian Netherlands. This policy the English Government found itself unable to countenance. It had no wish to render all future connection with Russia impossible; it was convinced that the result of the adoption of the views of Frederick William would be a still closer alliance between Austria and Russia. Though Pitt was prepared to co-operate with Prussia and Holland in preventing the dependence of the Austrian Netherlands upon France, he was opposed to

Peace between Austria and Turkey.

any recognition of Belgic independence, and hoped that a reconciliation between the Emperor and his revolted Provinces would eventually be accomplished. At the beginning of 1790 the aggressive policy of Prussia threatened Europe with a general war, and it seemed that England would be compelled either to support the designs of Frederick William or to break up the Triple Alliance. On February 18th, 1790, Joseph II. died, and his death saved Europe from an extension of the war. Prussia had in January made a treaty with Turkey, and in March she concluded an alliance with Poland. The conciliatory, though firm, attitude of the Emperor Leopold, however, gradually dissipated these dangers to the peace of Europe, and he was supported in his policy by England and Holland, the Governments of which continued to labour for the pacification of the Continent. Frederick William, discovering that the Poles refused to consent to the cession of Danzig and Thorn, and that England would not support his warlike policy, became more inclined to peaceful views. In August, 1790, he made with Leopold the Treaty of Reichenbach, the Emperor agreeing to make peace with the Turks. A year later, on August 4th, 1791, the Peace of Sistova was signed between Turkey and Austria, and Russia was left to continue the war alone. Leopold was enabled to turn his attention to the Netherlands, and early in 1791 his power was completely re-established. With Russia England was less successful. Early in 1790 Catherine had demanded the mediation of England, but Pitt refused to support the Russian claims, and hoped, by means of the Triple Alliance, to set up a barrier against the ambition of the Russian and Bourbon Powers. He opposed the occupation of Ochákov by Russia, and adopted in 1791 a strong anti-Russian policy (p. 394). The country refused to support this policy, and Pitt receded from his position. The Duke of Leeds, who had strongly advocated a warlike policy, retired, and Lord Grenville took his place at the Foreign Office. The triumph of Russia was complete, and on January 9th, 1792, anxious to take advantage of the outbreak of the French Revolution in order to further partition Poland, Catherine made the Treaty of Jassy.

England and Russia.

During these years Pitt had with difficulty avoided a war

against the combined forces of France and Spain over the affair of Nootka Sound. A trading settlement had been made by some English merchants at Nootka Sound, on Vancouver Island, and in April, 1789, the Spaniards seized an English ship, the *Iphigenia*, put her officers and crew in irons, hauled down the British flag, and destroyed the settlement. Later in the year other English vessels were also seized and detained. The news of these outrages reached England in February, 1790, and Pitt at once made extensive preparations. On May 5th a message from the King, announcing the prospect of war, was read to both Houses of Parliament, an envoy was sent to Madrid to demand full reparation, and Holland and Prussia declared themselves ready to support Great Britain. Spain on her part looked to Russia, and especially to France, for assistance. France and Spain were connected by the family compact of 1761, and Spain had during the American War come to the aid of France. It seemed at first unlikely that Louis XVI. could refuse to accede to the Spanish demands. A war in 1790 on the part of France and Spain against England would have changed the whole course of the French Revolution. Mirabeau, who was the most important member of the National Assembly, declared himself against England and in favour of war. If peace was to be preserved, and Pitt was always in favour of peace, some means must be brought to bear upon Mirabeau and Lafayette. Pitt thereupon sent Hugh Elliot, who had just returned from his successful embassy at Copenhagen, to Paris, and his influence with Mirabeau effected a complete change in the latter's attitude. Mirabeau declared in favour of peace. Lafayette, who had been influenced by Miles, another English agent, made no opposition. At the end of October, 1790, all danger of war with France and England was over; and Florida Blanca, the Spanish minister, finding that no help could be looked for from France, made with England the Treaty of the Escurial, in which Spain yielded all the disputed points. Pitt had won a great triumph. He had destroyed the family compact, he had preserved peace, and France remained isolated. Thus the Triple Alliance had been almost uniformly successful, and England, with her resources unexhausted, was able in 1793 to enter with vigour into the great war with France.

The Affair of Nootka Sound.

Till the close of 1792 Pitt persevered in his efforts to preserve peace. He had from the outbreak of the French Revolution declared distinctly that he intended to maintain a policy of neutrality, and his Budget of the spring of 1792 was framed upon a peace footing. But the progress of the Revolution made it impossible for him to hold aloof from hostilities. The French, after defeating the Prussians at Valmy in September, had adopted aggressive tactics. Nice and Savoy were seized. Belgium, after the battle of Jemmappes, was occupied, the Scheldt was declared open, and Holland was threatened with invasion. The decrees of November 19th and December 15th showed the temper of the Girondists, while the determination of Dumouriez to invade Holland rendered it necessary for Pitt to take measures to carry out the terms of the Treaties of 1788. After Louis XVI.'s death on January 21st, 1793, it became impossible to preserve peace between the two countries. War was declared on February 8th, England, Prussia, Austria, Spain and Holland attempted to conquer France, and Pitt's efforts were devoted to keeping together the coalition. The conquest of Holland in 1794, and the desertion of Prussia and Spain in 1795, rendered Pitt's task increasingly difficult, and upon the establishment of the Directory he opened negotiations for peace. In 1796 he again attempted to bring about a general pacification, and Lord Malmesbury was sent to Paris. The French, however, refused to entertain his proposals, but in 1797, at Lisle, negotiations were again opened with the same result.

England and France, 1795–1802.

In 1798–9 Pitt formed the Second Coalition, which, at first successful, ended in the retirement of Russia and the overthrow of Austria. In 1801 the resignation of Pitt (p. 371) left his successor, Addington, to continue the war. The defeat of the French by Abercrombie, in the battle of Alexandria on March 21st, was followed by the overthrow of the Danish fleet in the battle of Copenhagen on April 2nd. The Armed Neutrality (p. 478), reorganised in 1800 by the Tsar Paul, received a severe blow, the accession of Alexander I. converted Russia into an ally of England, and Addington was recalled to make the peace of Amiens. Though not a great war minister, Pitt had enjoyed the confidence of the

country. During the war England had held her own at sea and in the colonies, and his retirement on the question of Catholic emancipation was honourable both to himself and George III.

G. Le M. GRETTON. The Army.

THE declaration of war between England and France in 1742 found the trading companies of three European states with a footing in India. At Bombay the English had a factory, as the trading settlements were then termed. Close to Calcutta, the Dutch, the English and the French were planted on the Hooghly. On the east coast, the English at Madras struggled against the rivalry of the French at Pondicherry, where Dupleix, the Governor of the Settlement, took every opportunity of injuring his British neighbours. Dupleix was a man of boundless ambition and remarkable talents. He perceived that in the vast peninsula there was no unity, nothing but a loosely-connected and seething mass of disorganised despotisms, differing in race and creed; and he realised that a daring European nation might rule over the whole of India provided that the principle *Divide et Impera* became the keynote of their policy. He had long meditated the establishment of a French military empire in Southern India, and, as a first step, the expulsion of the English from Madras. The war gave Dupleix a chance; he captured Madras and held it until the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, when France exchanged it with England for Louisbourg, in Cape Breton Isle. This peace was but a truce; badly kept in America, in India it was virtually ignored, for the European Companies carried on their quarrel by selling their services to the rival princes whose struggles for the possession of the Deccan and the Carnatic devastated Southern India.

French and English in India.

At first the French and their allies were successful; but in 1751 Clive began to stem the tide of their victories. Three names stand out conspicuously in our military annals in the eighteenth century—Marlborough, Wolfe, and Clive. Marlborough and Wolfe were bred to arms, and learned their trade as subordinates before they rose to positions of command. Not so with Clive: he was not educated as a soldier,

and at twenty-seven he was a mere clerk in the factory at Madras, when, under pressure of the French troubles, more officers were needed and he was appointed captain in the service of the East India Company. Almost before the ink on his commission was dry, Clive had leapt into independent command, and had surprised the city of Arcot, an important point in the enemy's dominions. The French and their allies advanced against Clive, drove him into the citadel, and proceeded to besiege it. The fortress was more than a mile in circumference; the walls were in many places ruinous, the ramparts too narrow for guns to be mounted on them, the parapets weak and low. The only flanking fire along the walls was from half-ruined towers, and on none of these could more than a single cannon be mounted. The ditch was virtually useless, for where it was not dry and filled up with rubbish, it was easily fordable. To hold this apparently undefendable fort, Clive had a garrison of 200 Europeans and 300 sepoys, native soldiers trained by the English at Madras. Outside its crumbling walls were 2,000 sepoys, disciplined and led by French officers; 5,000 irregular infantry, 3,000 cavalry, and, more dangerous than all the rest, 150 picked French troops. After forty-eight days of siege the enemy attempted to storm, but, thanks to Clive's admirable arrangements and the good fire-discipline of his handful of men, the masses of infantry who swarmed up the breach were met by steady and perfectly controlled volleys. The heads of the column were swept away again and again, and their discomfiture was completed by showers of hand-grenades which the garrison flung among them. The attack failed: next day the siege was raised, and Clive was free to turn to Trichinopoly, which the French were then besieging. After obtaining reinforcements Clive marched southwards, to find a Franco-Indian army across his path at Kaveripak. After desperate fighting Clive defeated them with the loss of their artillery, and thus rendered possible the relief of Trichinopoly and the capture of the whole French army. But the guns he seized and the prisoners he made constituted but a small portion of the advantage which Clive won for his country on this hard-fought field. Before the siege of Arcot the natives of India believed that Englishmen could not

Clive's Defence of Arcot.

fight; and even after Clive's defence it was considered that his conduct was the exception which proved the rule. But after the battle of Kaveripak the quick Oriental mind realised that not only could the English fight, but that they could beat the French. The prestige which Clive thus acquired greatly helped him, a few years later, to wrest Bengal from the bloodstained hands of Surajah Dowlah.

Plassey.

Towards the end of 1756 Clive was summoned to Madras to save the Company's factory at Calcutta from impending ruin. Surajah Dowlah, the Nawab of Bengal, an Oriental despot of the worst type, had seized the Company's property; he had done to death 122 English men and women in the Black Hole of Calcutta; and the survivors of the little colony were in terror of their lives. Clive landed with a few hundred troops, worsted the Nawab in several skirmishes, and wrung from him compensation for these outrages. A nominal peace was made; but the longer Clive studied the character of the ruler of Bengal the more he became convinced that there would be no safety for the English while Surajah Dowlah remained in power. He, therefore, determined to depose him, and to replace him by a creature of his own—a puppet, through whom the Company should control Bengal. A suitable tool was found in Mir Jafir, one of Surajah Dowlah's generals. To obtain the throne this traitor agreed to betray his master, and to desert with all his troops at the battle then impending between the Nawab and the English. Surajah Dowlah's army, though numerically very formidable, was unwieldy, and, as far as his 35,000 infantry were concerned, poorly trained and disciplined; but his cavalry, 18,000 strong, were resolute well-drilled men, all recruited from the fighting races of Northern India. His artillery consisted of a small field battery, manned by French soldiers, and fifty-three large cannon, in charge of native gunners. Each of these guns was mounted on a huge wheeled platform, so heavy that the combined efforts of forty yoke of oxen tugging in front, and an elephant pushing behind were required to move it. To meet these masses of fighting men, Clive had only 950 European infantry, fifty sailors and half a dozen midshipmen to work his eight light guns, 200 half-castes, and 2,100 sepoys. When the two armies met on the field of Plassey, Clive for

several hours stood on the defensive; then, after repulsing a charge of the Nawab's cavalry, he ordered an advance. Surajah Dowlah fled; his generals hurriedly retreated, and the only troops who opposed Clive's forward movement were the French gunners, who fought with all the gallantry of their nation. Mir Jafir, who had waited until the last moment to declare himself, now joined his patron, Clive; and with the desertion of his large body of troops the battle ended. The victory of Plassey rendered the East India Company masters in fact, though not in name, of the three rich provinces of Bengal, Orissa, and Behar; for though Clive installed Mir Jafir upon the throne with all the customary solemnities, the new Nawab soon realised that his tenure of office was absolutely dependent upon the good-will of his English allies.

Hyder Ali in Southern India.

While Clive was securing for the Company the position of paramount power on the Ganges, his lieutenants had won for England high consideration among the States of Southern India. By the series of victories over the French which culminated in Lally's surrender of Pondicherry in 1761, England acquired much territory and more prestige. Our assistance was eagerly sought by the native princes in their endless wars; and thus we ultimately became embroiled with Hyder Ali, the Sultan of Mysore, a celebrated adventurer who raised himself from the position of a private soldier to that of the most powerful sovereign in Southern India. When, in 1780, the French were again at war with us, they allied themselves with Hyder Ali, and furnished him with officers who accompanied him in his terrible raid on the Carnatic, when at the head of 80,000 men he devastated the low-lying plains around Madras.

The Directory Intrigue against England.

In 1783 we made an inglorious peace with Tippoo, who, on the death of his father Hyder Ali, had succeeded to the throne of Mysore; and we brought to an equally inglorious termination the first of our series of wars with the great Mahratta Confederacy. For a few years there was comparative quiet; but as soon as war again broke out between England and France, French intriguers resumed their activity at the native courts. England feared a French

invasion of India, and in 1798-9 such an invasion by no means seemed impossible. In the north-west the troops of Scindia, one of the great Mahratta chiefs, were officered by French adventurers. In the Deccan the Nizam of Hyderabad was guarded by a regiment officered by Frenchmen. At Mysore, Tippoo (*le citoyen Tippoo*, as the Parisians called him), to please his French retainers, allowed them to plant a tree of liberty in his capital, and to ornament their uniforms with buttons engraved with the Phrygian cap. Through the Governor of the Mauritius he entered into an alliance with the Republic, and corresponded with Napoleon in Egypt. Bonaparte, who was longing to play the part of a modern Alexander, wrote to him from Cairo:—"You have been already informed of my arrival on the shores of the Red Sea with an innumerable and invincible army, full of the desire of releasing you from the iron yoke of the English." On discovering Tippoo's alliance with the French, the English promptly invaded his dominions with 30,000 men. They were accompanied by a large body of troops provided by the Nizam of Hyderabad, whose Frenchmen we had sent back to France, and who had now returned to his old allegiance to the Company. Wellington, then the young colonel of the 33rd, who was placed in command of this contingent, gives an interesting account of the order of march of the combined army. The Nizam's troops and the British force marched in two columns parallel to each other "almost in form of a square or oblong, of which the front and rear were formed of cavalry, and about two or three miles in extent; the right and left (owing to the immense space taken up in the column by field pieces, drawn by bullocks) about six or seven miles. In this square went everything belonging to the army." * Wellington goes on to say that 60,000 bullocks were employed in the British service; the grain for the Nizam's troops was carried by 25,000 oxen. When the whole army was in motion it covered about eighteen square miles.

A weary march brought this unwieldy army to the gates of Seringapatam; and after a siege, in which Wellington greatly distinguished himself, this stronghold of Mysore was carried by storm on May 4th, 1799.

* Wellington's Supplementary Despatches, i. 204.

Tippoo perished in the breach, and by his death relieved the English at Madras of a dangerous neighbour. Two years later the ever-recurring Mahratta trouble came to a head. The restless and warlike Mahratta tribes were a standing danger to their neighbours, the native states whom by treaty we had bound ourselves to protect; and, had they been united, they would even have threatened our power in Bombay, in Central India, and on the Ganges; but, happily for the ultimate peace of India, quarrels arose between two of their great chiefs—Scindia, whose territories were in the North-west, and the Peshwa who ruled at Poona, near Bombay. The Peshwa obtained our assistance, and Scindia, his rival, prepared for war. Two expeditions were sent against him, both of which were brilliantly successful. Lake won the battles of Aligahr and Laswari, captured Delhi and Agra, and scattered Scindia's French troops to the winds. Wellington was equally successful at the battles of Argaum and Assaye. At Assaye he fought against enormous odds, and gained his victory by the same calm good sense and rapid intuition which he afterwards exhibited on the battlefields of Europe. On the morning of September 23rd, 1803, Wellington, as he reconnoitred the enemy, found them posted along the bank of the River Katna, near its junction with the Jewah; 30,000 of the far-famed Mahratta cavalry were drawn up in glittering squadrons on the plain; 10,000 picked infantry, trained and officered by Frenchmen, a swarm of irregular infantry armed with matchlocks, and a park of 128 guns, also in charge of French adventurers, rested on the village of Assaye, on the left of the line. After a flanking movement by the English, followed by a corresponding change of front by the enemy, the fight began. Wellington decided to attack the enemy on their right, and, therefore, ordered the troops on the British right to advance slowly and with frequent halts. But the orders were not obeyed, and the infantry and artillery on our right hurried forward, only to be met by so well directed a fire from the Mahratta guns that they staggered under it. The native general, with the eye of a true soldier, ordered his cavalry to charge the shaken infantry; but Wellington was too quick for him. He hurled four regiments of cavalry at the Mahratta horsemen; the English dragoons,

Wellington at Assaye.

supported on either flank by their Madrassee comrades, charged at speed across the plain, fell upon the enemy before they had fairly got under weigh, and drove them headlong back. While, under cover of this cavalry fight, the British troops recovered their solidity, Wellington was steadily winning on the left and centre of his line; the Mahrattas fighting hard, fell back across the river, and there formed up in threatening masses. Our cavalry dashed across the stream, dispersed the enemy's infantry, and then turned back to meet a fresh and unexpected danger. Numbers of the Mahrattas, pretending to be dead, had allowed our men to pass over them. Now they had manned the abandoned guns, and played upon us as we advanced beyond them. After effectually quieting these impostors, Wellington's cavalry once more met their peers. The Mahratta squadrons again advanced, but our men so fiercely charged them that Scindia's far-famed horse fled for twelve miles before them, without once drawing rein. Ninety-two guns fell into our hands, and the victory, though costly, was decisive. Wellington went into action with about 4,500 men, of whom only one cavalry regiment and two infantry regiments were English regulars. He was also nominally supported by 5,000 cavalry from the Peshwa's army, whose fidelity was more than doubtful, and who took no part in the engagement. His losses were 428 killed, and more than 1,100 wounded, figures which conclusively prove that a new era in our Indian wars had commenced, and that in the future we should encounter foemen worthy of our steel.

To trace year by year, or even decade by decade, the marvellous growth of British power in India would be here impossible. Suffice it to say that when Clive exchanged the pen for the sword, the East India Company occupied three or four small trading stations in Hindustan, where, by the grace of the native princes, they were permitted to live and sell their goods. Half a century later, at the end of the second Mahratta war in 1805, the English were paramount along the Ganges Valley from Delhi to Calcutta; while on the East coast their territory extended from the Hooghly to Cape Comorin, and comprised nearly the whole of Southern India. The troops by whose valour this mighty expansion was effected were always vastly inferior in numbers to the native armies

whom they fought. Nor were our soldiers all Europeans. On the contrary, the proportion of Englishmen to natives in the Company's service was always small. Thus, in 1773 9,000 white men and 45,000 sepoys wore the British uniform in India; and at the close of the second Mahratta war there were 25,000 English soldiers to 130,000 natives. But the British in India greatly surpassed their enemies in courage, in mobility, and in discipline; our sepoys were drilled and trained on exactly the same system as their white comrades, and when well led by good English officers, always proved themselves ready to follow wherever the British troops would lead.

Number of European Soldiers in India.

Tactics.

The tactics by which our generals won their battles in India against overwhelming odds were to threaten the front, while making as strong an attack as possible against the enemy's weaker flank. His vast numbers of infantry, too poorly drilled to be able to change front to meet the sudden danger, fell into confusion; our frontal attack, suddenly and vigorously pressed home, produced a panic; the line broke, the enemy fled in all directions, and the victory was ours. Both in India and in England our drill was modelled on that devised by Frederick the Great for the Prussian army. It is curious to notice how little the "close order" drill of a battalion has varied in *essentials* during the last hundred years. No doubt the movements then were numerous, and so complicated that General Dundas, an English military writer of the last century, devotes a huge quarto volume to elucidating them. Now they are very few in number and perfectly easy to understand; but the same principles underlie them both—the rapid transference of men from column into line, and back again into column.

Reform in Military Finance.

Before alluding to the vicissitudes of the British arms in Europe, it is desirable to mention an important reform which was effected in 1783 in the management of the army. In chapter xv. (IV., p. 374) reference was made to the extraordinary financial relationship existing in the Stuart period between the Crown and the officers of each regiment, by which the latter in effect contracted, in return for a lump sum paid to them annually, to raise and to pay, to equip and to maintain, a specified number of soldiers fit for active service. If there

were a profit on the transaction for the year, a dividend was declared among the officers who commanded companies; if, on the other hand, the outgoings had been heavy and recruits expensive to procure, the deficit was met by a call, which had to be made good out of the captains' private means. This system, a survival of mediæval times (II., p. 327) lasted more than a century; and it was not until Burke's Act was passed that the War Office, by assuming direct control over the recruiting and financial arrangements of the army, removed from the British officer's path the temptations to peculation which had previously confronted him at every moment of his career.

Warfare in Europe.

In 1793 our last and greatest struggle with the French commenced, as has been the case in most of our wars, with a disaster. The Duke of York, a royal prince, whose stupidity as a man was only equalled by his ignorance as a general, was sent with a contingent of 20,000 British and 10,000 Hanoverian troops to reinforce our Allies in the Low Countries. His English troops were bad, for since the close of the American war the army had sunk into a wretched condition, "lax in its discipline, entirely without system, and very weak in numbers. Each colonel of a regiment managed it according to his notions or neglected it altogether. There was no uniformity of drill or movement; professional pride was rare; professional knowledge still more so. . . . Every department was more or less inefficient. The regimental officers, as well as their men, were hard drinkers, and the latter, under a loose discipline, were addicted to marauding and acts of licentious violence."* As in their *morale*, so in their *physique*, these soldiers left much to be desired, for many of the recruits who landed at Antwerp in 1793 were either too old or too young for active service; while whole regiments were unable to march to the front on account of physical infirmities. It is not surprising that these indifferent troops, commanded by such a general as the Duke of York, failed to distinguish themselves. Although they fought bravely on many occasions, they could not withstand the savage energy of the French. In 1794 Pichegru,

The Condition of the Army.

* Bunbury, "Narrative of Campaign in North Holland" (London, 1849), pp. iii., iv.

after defeating the Allies at Fleurus, turned upon the Duke of York, chased him through Holland, in all the horror of the worst winter known for a century, and finally hunted into Bremen the wretched remnant of this miserable expedition. The loss in the actions in which our troops took part was not heavy; but our sanitary and hospital arrangements were so bad that, in 1794, a return of "killed or dead in service" gave the startling figure of 18,596 lost in the campaign of 1793. Throughout this expedition, indeed, disorganisation reigned supreme, and forethought, system, and arrangement were alike conspicuous by their absence. The commissariat were so inefficient that frequently no rations were served out to the soldiers for forty-eight hours together; and the men's shoes were not replaced as they wore out, though the troops were marching through deep snow and across frozen rivers. The staff officers were utterly ignorant of their duty; and no man in the army, from the Commander-in-Chief downwards, seemed to take the slightest account of time. Wellington, who served in this disastrous campaign, and who profited much by its painful lessons, used in after years to say that it was a marvel to him how any of the English escaped. "If we happened to be at dinner and the wine was going round, it was considered wrong to interrupt us. I have seen a packet handed in from the Austrian headquarters, and thrown aside with the remark, 'That will keep till to-morrow morning.'"

The Campaign in Holland.

During the next four years no British army landed on the Continent; but combined naval and military operations in Africa and in Asia gave occupation to our soldiery. The virtual absorption of Holland by the French Republic had enlisted the Dutch on the side of our foes; and we accordingly wrested from Holland two all-important strategic points on the way to India, Ceylon, and the Cape of Good Hope. There were also minor expeditions against the islands in the West Indies, in which we were usually successful, though at a heavy cost. The climate, not the enemy, was chiefly responsible for the loss to the Service of more than 40,000 soldiers, who, in 1795-6, were discharged, invalided "on account of wounds or infirmity."

These distant expeditions and the disgrace of the Duke of York's *fiasco* did not tend to popularise the army; men would

not join the ranks; and when, in 1799, another expedition to Holland was planned, militiamen had to be bribed with heavy bounties to enlist into the regular service. It is difficult to realise that the country again allowed the king to foist his incompetent soldier-son into a command on active service; but so it was. The Duke of York commanded the mixed force of English and Russians who landed in Holland. He lost about 10,000 men in five engagements; was badly beaten, and obliged to retreat to the shores of the North Sea, where he expected to find a fleet of transports. No transports appeared, however, so he surrendered to the French, and his hapless followers only escaped detention in French fortresses by being exchanged for a corresponding number of Frenchmen, then prisoners of war in England.

Abercrombie in Egypt.

Undaunted by their Dutch experiences, in 1800 the English Ministry organised another expedition, the command of which was given, not to the Duke of York, but to Sir Ralph Abercrombie, a professional soldier of repute. His destination was Egypt, where the French army, though abandoned by Napoleon, still maintained its position, and threatened our power in the East. His orders were if possible to work in co-operation with Baird's expeditionary force from India, to obtain assistance from the Turks, and to drive the French out of the valley of the Nile. On the voyage our troops suffered considerably. The transports were so leaky that the men were constantly wet through; so ill supplied that the soldiers had no hammocks and slept on the bare decks with no bedding but their blankets. After touching at Malta, the island fortress which we had just taken from the French, Abercrombie was detained for six weeks at Cyprus waiting for cavalry remounts promised by the Turks. This time was usefully employed in constantly training the troops to embark and disembark with rapidity; so that when, on March 7th, 1801, our fleet of nearly 200 sail anchored in Aboukir Bay, every soldier thoroughly understood his duty. When the signal to land was given, the men swarmed down the sides of the ships, and without confusion took their allotted place in the boats. On a second signal, these troop-boats, formed up in three long lines of fifty each, made for the shore, in silence broken only by the regular dip of hundreds

of oars in the water. When they came within range of the French who lined the yellow sandhills on the coast, a tremendous fire of grape and musketry was opened upon them. Several boats were sunk outright, and the troops, crowded together at the bottom of the boats, with their muskets between their knees, suffered severely. But there was no thought of pausing; the bluejackets pulled harder than ever, the soldiers cheered lustily, and as soon as the water was shallow enough, sprang overboard and waded to the shore. Rapidly forming up, they rushed the sandhills and drove away the French at the point of the bayonet. Thus the landing of the first division of the English force was triumphantly effected, but at a heavy loss; the French fire cost 650 gallant men their lives.* As soon as the remainder of Abercrombie's troops were landed, he followed the French towards Alexandria, although he was without any news of Baird, who, as a matter of fact, was still beating against head winds in the Red Sea.

On the 21st of March took place the battle of Alexandria, an engagement insignificant in point of numbers, for there were but 12,000 combatants on each side, but of very great moral effect, as it proved to the world that there were still troops in Europe who could beat the French in fair and open fight. Abercrombie was encamped on a sandy isthmus, a mile wide, which separated Lake Naadah from the Mediterranean. Opposite to him, entrenched on a line of heights in front of Alexandria, lay the French, determined that before the Turks began to menace their flank in Syria, or Baird arrived from India to threaten them in rear, the English should be driven headlong to their ships. It was still black night when our troops, in accordance with Abercrombie's rule, roused themselves from sleep and stood to their arms ready for action. Suddenly a rattle of musketry at the front showed that the precaution was well taken and that the enemy were advancing upon the outposts. On the left the French contented themselves with a distant cannonade; in the centre the steady aspect of the Guards prevented them from coming to close quarters; the danger of their attack was on the right of our line. It is difficult to imagine anything more confused and at the same time more picturesque than this battle, begun

* An excellent account will be found in the prize essay of Major Elmslie, R.A. (*Journal of the United Service Institution*, May, 1895).

in the darkness of the night and continued in the mist of the morning. Columns of French suddenly appeared among our troops, and were driven back by steady, well-directed volleys; guided by the flashes, the enemy hurried up reinforcements in the gloom, which actually passed unnoticed between the two wings of an English regiment. When our men discovered that they were thus divided, they wheeled inwards and attacked the enemy with the bayonet. There were fierce charges and counter-charges, and guns and colours were lost and won before the French column disappeared into the darkness from which they had surprised our men. During this combat the 28th Regiment (the Gloucestershire) were immortalising themselves hard by. While the regiment, in two ranks, were hotly engaged with the enemy in front, a watchful officer suddenly heard behind him a French word of command, and recognised the glazed hats of the Republicans closing upon the rear. Without a moment's hesitation the English colonel ordered the rear rank to "turn about," and thus, standing back to back, the "thin red line" thrust the French resolutely from them. Then twelve hundred French cavalry swept wildly through our camp; they nearly broke the 42nd (Black Watch) by falling on their flank in the dim light, but the Highlanders formed groups and repelled them with the bayonet. At length the French retreated, leaving 2,000 men upon the field. Our loss was 1,500, and the brave General Abercrombie received his death wound in the battle. Hutchinson succeeded him, and in the course of a few months had made prisoners of 24,000 French troops, the whole garrison of Egypt, who, in accordance with the terms of their capitulation, were transported back to France. The Indian contingent under Baird arrived just in time to take part in the concluding operations of the campaign. Their voyage from Bombay to the Gulf of Suez had lasted six months, and immediately after landing they had performed the feat of marching, in nine days, a hundred and forty miles across the desert, from the Red Sea to the Nile, in a temperature of 115° in the shade.

The Peace of Amiens.

The Peace of Amiens, in 1802, put an end to hostilities: we abandoned our conquests, excepting the islands of Ceylon and Trinidad, and we agreed to restore Malta to the Knights if the

Great Powers would guarantee them its possession. With the childlike belief in the durability of peace which has always distinguished this country, our ministry proceeded to disarm. They disembodied the militia, which had been nine years under arms, and they disbanded the numerous fencible regiments of infantry and cavalry which had been raised during the war. A few months after the Peace of Amiens was signed the regular army in England was reduced to about 40,000 men; and thus, when the war broke out again in 1803, the whole process of re-establishing our land forces had to be hurriedly undertaken at infinite expense and great loss of efficiency.

W. LAIRD CLOWES. The Navy.

THE naval voyages undertaken during this period for the purposes of exploration, or of the extension of the empire, were of considerable importance. In 1785, a body of merchants, called the King George's Sound Company, chartered two vessels to open up a trade from the north-west coast of North America to China, and gave the command of them to Henry Portlock and George Dixon, who had been companions of Cook on some of his voyages. And in 1787, Commodore Arthur Philip, in the *Sirius* (20), Captain John Hunter, accompanied by the *Supply*, and nine transports, having on board a great number of convicts of both sexes, left Spithead for New South Wales, in order to establish a penal colony at Botany Bay. The expedition was escorted one hundred leagues to the westward by the *Hyæna* (20), Captain Michael de Courcy. Philip arrived on January 14th, 1788, and when the convicts had been landed he assumed the governorship. Soon afterwards the French expedition, under La Peyrouse, which had left France in 1785, touched at the place; and during its stay many of the convicts made determined attempts to escape with it. There were numerous other difficulties, but in time Philip vanquished them all; and when he returned to England in 1793, the young colony, which has since grown to such important proportions, and has become so different a place from what was originally intended, was firmly established. Another venture of 1787 was the formation of the Sierra Leone Company; but

Exploration.

it requires mention here only because the scheme owed its origin to Lieutenant John Matthews, who had made a voyage to the coast in 1785.

It is doubly surprising that the fate of the *Bounty* mutineers (p. 401) remained so long in doubt, when it is recollected that during part of the interval the Pacific was being explored by one of the most energetic and successful of maritime discoverers, Captain George Vancouver, who, in the *Discovery* (10), accompanied by the *Chatham* (4), armed tender, under Lieutenant William Robert Broughton, left the Thames on January 26th, 1791, and quitted the Channel early in the following April. His instructions were to proceed to, and survey, the Sandwich Islands ; to go thence to Nootka Sound (p. 376), and to take over from the Spaniards the settlement there ; to survey the coast of what is now Vancouver Island; and to return home by way of the Sandwich Islands, Cape Horn, and the western coast of South America. Having gone out by the Cape of Good Hope, he struck the south-west point of Australia, coasted eastwards, sighted Van Dieman's Land, surveyed part of the south shore of New Zealand, and spent nearly a month at Otaheite. Thence the vessels went to the Sandwich Islands, and so to Vancouver, then known generally as Nootka, the shores of which were thoroughly explored and surveyed. In Nootka Sound, after some time, the expedition was joined by the *Dædalus*, store-ship, which had been sent out from England under Lieutenant Richard Hergest, who made several valuable discoveries, but was killed at Oahu ere he reached the American coast. The Spaniards proved unwilling to surrender Nootka, and there was consequently much delay, which Vancouver utilised by making further surveys up and down the Pacific shores of the continent. In October, 1793, Lieutenant Broughton was sent home with despatches, and the command of the *Chatham* was entrusted to Lieutenant Peter Puget, whose name was thus associated with the great inlet in what is now Washington. Explorations and surveys were continued along the west coast of America and in the northern Pacific ; and on February 25th, 1794, Hawaii was formally taken over by Vancouver in the name of King George III. Later, the shores of what is now British Columbia were also taken possession of; and when, on the 20th October, 1795, the *Discovery* arrived in the Thames, she had been

absent four years, eight months, and twenty-nine days. A few months earlier, Broughton, then a commander, had commissioned, and departed in, the *Providence* for another voyage. He went out to Nootka by much the same route as had been taken by Vancouver, and upon his arrival found that the Spaniards had evacuated the place. Thence he crossed the northern Pacific to Japan and China. Although he lost his ship, he continued his explorations and surveys in a purchased schooner of 80 tons, and, after having done very valuable service, returned to England in February, 1799.

Promotion.

During the peace the subject of promotion from post to flag-rank on several occasions occupied the attention of the country and of Parliament. In 1787, Sir Matthew White Ridley took up in the House of Commons the case of Captain David Brodie, who, though a captain of nearly forty years' standing, and much senior to many officers who had been given their flags, had been repeatedly passed over. This came to nothing, but in the following year, in the House of Lords, the general subject of promotion to the flag was brought forward by Lord Rawdon. By an order in Council, dated 1718, the Admiralty had been directed to proceed in the promotion of officers to admiral's rank, according to the seniority of the captains on the list, regard being only had to their service qualifications for the rank to which promotion was sought. Another order of 1747 had directed the Admiralty to superannuate such captains of long and meritorious service as might be disabled from serving as admirals, owing to age or infirmity. But in the promotion of September, 1787, when sixteen captains were promoted to flag rank, upwards of forty captains were passed over. Some of these had refused the offer of superannuation, because they not only deemed that their past services entitled them to better treatment, but also believed themselves to be perfectly fit for future service; and the partial nature of the promotions, perhaps naturally, created a good deal of disgust, disappointment, and apprehension, since no officer could thenceforth feel sure of securing the rewards which he felt that he had earned. Such was Lord Rawdon's contention. His motion was finally negatived without a division; but that fact did not prevent the same question from being immediately afterwards brought forward in the Commons, where three separate

debates on the same subject took place at short intervals. Although it appeared that no producible rule had been employed in making selections for flags, and that, while some officers who were infirm had been promoted, others who were equally meritorious and not infirm at all had been passed over, the Administration was in each case victorious, in deference, no doubt, to the general sense that there might be more danger in promotion by seniority tempered only by physical health, than in promotion by seniority tempered by selection, even if, in the latter event, no reasons for the ministers' action were vouchsafed. The senior captain promoted in 1787 had held post-rank for thirty years, and the junior had held it for twenty-six years; and had not some such course as was taken been adopted, not only would the flag list have had an increasing tendency to consist almost exclusively of men on the verge of dotage, but also certain officers who subsequently rendered the most valuable services in war-time would have been kept on the captains' list for so long a period that they would not have been eligible for the commands in which they gained their greatest fame. The selection of the sixteen captains chosen for promotion in 1787 by Lord Howe, who was then First Lord of the Admiralty, is best justified by the fact that the list contains the names of William Hotham, afterwards Lord Hotham; Sir John Jervis, afterwards Earl St. Vincent; and Adam Duncan, afterwards Viscount Duncan. If a similar method had not been pursued then, and for some time subsequently, it would have been impossible for Nelson to obtain his flag, as he did, after less than eighteen years' service as captain, and, in all probability, the fleet at the time of Trafalgar would have been under the orders of an officer of between seventy and seventy-five, instead of under those of a man of forty-seven. The action of the Admiralty, therefore, though it certainly pressed hardly on individuals, was undoubtedly for the good of the country.

Bounties to Seamen.

In the meantime seamen were encouraged. In 1788 a proclamation was issued, recalling all British seamen from foreign service, and prohibiting them from entering into foreign service without a licence; and in 1791, at the time of the Russian scare (p. 375), the following bounties were offered:—To an able seaman, £3; to an ordinary seaman, £2; and to an able-bodied landsman, £1. At the

beginning of the war in 1793, in addition to the royal bounty, the City of London offered £2 to every able, and £1 to every ordinary, seaman; and in the following year the same public-spirited body held out to every able seaman 10 guineas; to every ordinary seaman, 8 guineas; to every landsman, 6 guineas; and to boys, 1 and 2 guineas, according to height. In 1795 the bounties rose still higher, in some places exceeding £30 a head; yet the supply was so unequal to the demand that in that year an Act had to be passed for the raising of a certain number of men from every county, the proportion varying from 23 in Rutland to 1,081 in Yorkshire; and a few weeks later another Act ordered an embargo on all British shipping until a further quota of men, levied upon the several ports, should be raised. In this case the assessment varied from three for the Scilly Islands and Prestonpans to 1,711 for Liverpool and 5,704 for London. In 1795, also, an Act was passed to enable warrant and petty officers and seamen to allot part of their pay for the maintenance of their wives and families, and to enable seamen's letters to pass to and fro at a uniform charge of one penny. Another Act permitted officers, on appointment from half-pay, to apply for a certain amount of pay in advance. And in 1796 the pay of lieutenants was increased. But the demands of the service, especially for men to man the fleet, continued to outrun the supply, and in 1798 it was found necessary to suspend all protection from the operations of the press-gang for one month in the case of the coal trade, and for five months in other cases. Amid such circumstances it is astonishing that the sea-borne trade of the country was not crushed out of existence. Still more astonishing is it that in spite of the press, and of the enormous number of captures made by the enemy, the trade, after the war had fairly begun, developed amazingly.

Unsuitable Officers.

But it is not astonishing that, when ships were largely manned by a process of kidnapping, and when the scum of the population went, together with some of the better elements, into the Navy, there was a vast amount of discontent—a discontent which was not diminished by the tyranny of a certain class of officers.

Then, as in all ages, there were officers and officers; but the conclusion of the American war left us with, perhaps, a larger proportion than at any other period of officers who

were more or less unsuitable for the position. One case may be cited as an illustration of the kind of the man who, at that time, might and did become a post-captain. John Perkins, known throughout the Navy of the end of the eighteenth century as "Jack Punch," was a lieutenant of 1782, a commander of 1797, and a captain of 1800; and he died in Jamaica in 1812. His bravery and dash cannot be challenged, and his success, particularly while in command of the *Drake*, *Arab*, and *Tartar*, was extraordinary; but he was surely one of the strangest characters who ever held a British post-commission. According to an officer who served with him on the Leeward Station, the general belief was that he was a mulatto, born out of wedlock in the Island of St. Domingo. His father was probably some British captain, who, as the readiest way of providing for the young incumbrance, placed him on his own, or a friend's, quarter-deck. Be this as it may, Perkins had so little education that he could neither write nor read, though, for service purposes, he had learnt the mechanical art of signing his name. He seems never to have been appointed to a ship serving elsewhere than in the West Indies; and whenever he was on half-pay he lived at Kingston, Jamaica, where his establishment, so far as his relations with the other sex were concerned, scandalised a not very exacting generation, and where his numerous children, "of all shades except pure black," formed, for many years afterwards, a strong contingent in the local army of bumboat women, fruit-sellers, and washerwomen. There cannot have been many officers like Perkins; yet an age which admitted him, and which permitted Lord Rodney to promote his son John from the rank of midshipman to that of post-captain in one month and four days, at a time when the boy was only fifteen years and five months old, must, it is evident, have been an age when almost any abuse was possible.

The Mutinies.

To this cause may be referred many of the alarming and disgraceful mutinies which were characteristic of the period. That of the crew of the *Bounty* (p. 401) is attributable quite as much to the severity of Bligh as to the attractions of Otaheite. In 1797 a serious mutiny in the fleet at Spithead was followed by an even more dangerous one in the fleets at the Nore and in the North Sea. In these lamentable cases the alleged grievances

were, in the first instance, insufficient pay and pensions, insufficient provisions, lack of care for the sick and embezzlement of the comforts supplied for seamen's use, insufficient leave on shore, and stoppage of pay of wounded men; and, in each of the directions indicated, concessions were made by the Admiralty. But when the disaffection spread to the Nore, additional demands were made to the effect that officers who had been turned out of any ship by the mutineers should not be again employed in the same ship without the consent of the ship's company; that indemnification should be made to any man who had run, and that he should not be liable to arrest as a deserter; and that the Articles of War should be altered in several particulars. To most of the fresh demands the Admiralty returned a refusal; and as Richard Parker, the leader of the mutineers, persisted, the situation became most threatening, for a very large number of ships were implicated. Happily, the Admiralty showed a firmness to which it had before been a stranger; and after a period of terrible anxiety, the country learnt that the mutiny had collapsed. Here, tyranny was not pleaded as an exciting cause, though in certain ships, and in several minor mutinies of about the same time, it was undoubtedly a factor. But in the case of the terrible mutiny of the crew of the *Hermione*, in September of the same year, tyranny, and tyranny alone, was responsible. The frigate, under Captain Hugh Pigot, a brave man, yet a consummate bully, was cruising off the west end of Puerto Rico, when, exasperated by the last of a series of brutalities, the crew rose and murdered the captain. Such an act of vengeance can, of course, in no instance be justified; but in this case it was rendered even more abominable by the excesses with which it was accompanied. Not only Pigot, but also nine other officers, including a midshipman, a mere boy, were massacred; and the villainy was completed by the handing over of the frigate to the enemies of the country. The nearly simultaneous mutiny in the *Tremendous* at the Cape of Good Hope was also professedly brought about by the cruelty of the captain, who, however, when, at his own request, tried for it, was honourably acquitted. The same thing was probably also at the bottom of the mutiny of the *Danaë*, in 1800, and of other similar outbreaks.

At the moment of the commencement of the war with

Strength of the Navy.

France, in February, 1793, the active personal establishment of the Royal Navy was as follows:—Admiral of the Fleet, 1; admirals, 16; vice-admirals, 25; rear-admirals, 22; post-captains, 431; commanders, 163; lieutenants, 1,429, and masters, 297; and the total number of seamen and marines, including officers of all ranks, was 45,000. In October, 1801, at the time of the cessation of hostilities preparatory to the signature of the Treaty of Amiens, the establishment consisted of—Admiral of the Fleet, 1; admirals, 45; vice-admirals, 39; rear-admirals, 59; post-captains, 516; commanders, 391; lieutenants, 2,135; and masters, 517, making, with seamen and marines of all ranks, a total of 135,000. In the same period the supplies voted for naval purposes grew in proportion. In 1793 the total was but £4,003,984; in 1801 it was £16,577,037. And the increase in the *matériel* of the Navy was commensurate. This will be seen in the appended table:—

	1793.		1801.	
Class.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
First rates	7	15,859	13	30,384
Second rates	24	46,892	21	41,719
Third rates	119	186,448	151	249,434
Fourth rates	25	27,004	28	31,390
Fifth rates	93	74,729	150	140,920
Sixth rates	41	22,923	44	24,062
Sloops	49	14,732	116	39,316
Bombs	2	609	14	4,687
Fireships	6	2,547	3	1,091
Total	366	391,743	540	563,003

These lists do not include all the small craft, yachts, transports, etc. Including everything, the Navy of 1793 embraced 411 vessels of 402,555 tons; and the Navy of 1801, 781 vessels of 650,976 tons. The increment was largely due to hostile vessels captured and purchased into the Navy. During the course of the war Great Britain took from her various foes 570 ships of war, of one sort or another, mounting 15,934 guns; and lost to her enemies only 59 ships of war, mounting but 1,272 guns; so that there remained in favour of this country a difference of 511 ships of war and 14,662 guns. In addition she captured 903 foreign privateers, some of which also were bought into the Navy.

Improvement in naval tactics was a natural evolution, the result of experience. In the seventeenth century, and the beginning of the eighteenth, a sea battle was generally fought as if by tacit agreement between the two commanders-in-chief, on set principles, the central and ruling idea ever present to the mind of each admiral being that he must, with his fleet in column of line ahead, place himself as nearly as possible on a course parallel with that of his opponent, and so engage, ship to ship and broadside to broadside. He was taught, as well by service traditions as by the printed regulations, that he must at all hazards keep his fleet in its columnar formation, and not suffer it to quit that formation upon any pretence whatsoever. Yet, from time to time, bold spirits attempted innovations, even at the risk of their professional position. What may be called the personal, as distinct from the official, method of conducting an action received several illustrations—to which, perhaps, sufficient attention has not been paid by naval writers—during the Dutch wars of the Commonwealth and the reign of Charles II.; and admirals became gradually less and less hide-bound by written rules, until progress was temporarily checked by the finding of the court-martial in the case of Mathews, after the unfortunate battle of 1744. Mathews had ventured to quit the line; but as some of his captains, with the fear of the regulations before their eyes, if not, indeed, from less worthy motives, had not followed him, failure had resulted, and Mathews was broken. Deterred by the fate of Mathews, Byng went to the other extreme, and was punished still more severely for the fiasco of 1756. But these trials, though so lamentable, and, it may be, so unjust in their results, had the effect of clearing the air. Hawke had been with Mathews, and had been the one captain who had properly backed him up. The trial did not affect the strong character of Hawke as it had affected the weaker character of Byng. It did not render Hawke timorous about incurring responsibility. Nor did it daunt Rodney, who though he had not fought in the battle off Toulon, had been one of Mathews's *protegés*. These officers, and especially the former, seriously studied naval tactics, not as if the beginning and ending of them were contained in the Fighting Instructions, but as if tactics were still an infant science.

Naval Tactics.

Independently they came to the conclusion that there might be better systems of attack than those contained in the Instructions; and, independently, they decided that, when themselves leading a fleet, they must pay more attention to conditions of time, position, and opportunity than to any formal or traditional directions. Each carried out this decision. Hawke, at Quiberon Bay, flung convention to the winds, and won a startling victory. Whether the breaking of the enemy's line, at the battle of the Saintes, was the deliberate work of Rodney is exceedingly doubtful; but Rodney did some unconventional work on other occasions, and, in the battle of the Saintes, the breaking of the line by Rodney's fleet undoubtedly set, as it were, the final seal of success upon the previously still contested theory that a commander-in-chief must command rather by means of his personal ability and initiative than by any rule of thumb. From that time the ancient methods of fighting were almost neglected. Byng, and even Mathews, would have stood aghast at the spectacle afforded at the Nile, Copenhagen, or Trafalgar. The progress, nay, the revolution, effected in half a century was due mainly to the force of character and self-reliance of a few of the men to whom England was so fortunate as to entrust her naval destinies at the most trying periods of her later career; but it was due also, in some measure, to work done, not at sea but on shore, and not only in England, but also on the Continent. The treatises of Paul Hoste, of Bigot de Merogues, and of Clerk of Eldin, were assuredly not without influence upon the development of practical naval tactics, and so upon the triumphs of the British flag.

The course of the War of 1793-1802 cannot be followed in detail here. It only needs saying that, as Mahan points out, quoting Henri Martin, "The Montagnards and the Jacobins were resolved, like the Girondists, to propagate afar, by arms, the principles of the Revolution, and hoped by hurling defiance at all kings to put France in the impossibility of recoiling or stopping herself." When the French people had fairly launched themselves upon this mad policy, they could not be checked save by armed physical opposition. The desired result

"had been effected and maintained chiefly by the Sea Power of Great Britain, the prime agent and moving spirit—directly through her Navy,

indirectly through the subsidies drawn from her commerce; and the latter had nearly doubled while carrying on this arduous and extensive war. In 1801 the aggressive tendencies of the French nation, as a whole, were exhausted. So far as they still survived, they were now embodied in and dependent upon a single man, in which shape they were at once more distinctly to be recognised and more odious. They were also less dangerous; because the power of one man, however eminent for genius, is far less for good or evil than the impulse of a great people."

By the side of Cook's achievements all subsequent ventures of English explorers between 1780 and 1815 are insignificant. The chief of these was associated with a romantic history. In December, 1787, one of Cook's old companions, Lieutenant William Bligh, was sent out to introduce the bread-fruit tree from Tahiti into the West Indies. Before doubling the Horn violent westerly gales led him to turn, cross the South Atlantic, and make Tahiti from the west. He loaded his ship with bread-fruit trees and sailed again on the 4th of April, 1789. But on the 27th the whole crew mutinied (p. 396), except eighteen men; these, with the captain, were cast adrift in the launch with 150 pounds of bread, 28 gallons of water, a little rum, wine and pork, some cocoanuts, four cutlasses, a quadrant and compass. "He'll find his way home," shouted some of the mutineers, "if you give him pencil and paper; he'll have a vessel built in a month." Bligh made his way in this open boat, 23 feet long, without a chart, a distance of 3,618 miles, from Tahiti to Timor, discovering a part of the New Hebrides on the way that had not been noticed either by Cook or Bougainville. The voyage entailed terrible sufferings, but the men were saved by being able to stop on the thirtieth day on the north coast of New Holland. On the 41st day, 14th June, 1789, they reached the Dutch settlements. Bligh returned to England in a schooner from Timor, March 14th, 1790, and his narrative of the voyage excited immense interest and some indignation. After a time the frigate *Pandora* was sent out to Tahiti to punish the mutineers. But only ten were found;* the rest had escaped to Pitcairn's

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY. Exploration.

The Voyage of the "Bounty."

The Mutiny.

Bligh's Escape.

* These were brought home, and three of them were executed in England.

Island, lately discovered by Carteret, with their Tahitian wives and some other islanders (1790). Here they remained unknown, except for an American visit in 1808, till in 1814 an English frigate touched at the island, and found John Adams, the originator of the Pitcairn settlement, alone surviving from the crew, but with a colony of 47 people under his rule, of mixed English and Tahitian blood.

The Settlement at Pitcairn's Island.

The greater part of English exploration in this period was undertaken in the southern quarters of the globe. There was comparatively little effort to extend our discoveries in the northern parts of Asia or America. A further attempt was, indeed, made at Arctic exploration (p. 22), by "the Spitzbergen route" in 1773; but the two ships *Racehorse* and *Carcass*, despatched on this mission, under command of Captain Phipps (p. 211), found it impossible to penetrate the Polar pack to the north of the Spitzbergen group, and returned to England after an absence of three months. But the British conquest of Canada, like that of Central India, prepared the way for the minute survey of vast continental tracts but vaguely known before.

Other Geographical Progress.

At the end of the eighteenth century a fresh start was made, and with this three great names are associated. James Bruce, by his travels in Algeria, Nubia, and Abyssinia (1765–72), and his discovery of the source of the Blue Nile at Geesh (1770), was the pioneer of latter day exploration in the interior of the dark continent. Mungo Park, again, by his two journeys in Western Africa (1795–97 and 1805–6), and his exploration of much of the course of the Upper Niger, started English enterprise upon a line of discovery which, since the days of Andrew Battell, in the reign of Elizabeth, had been too much neglected by our countrymen. Once more, Matthew Flinders, a surveyor of the first quality, followed up Cook's work on the Australian coasts, in 1795–1800 and in 1801–3, with such effect that his plans still form the basis of the Admiralty charts for a great deal of the northern, eastern, and southern coasts of the great island, and for nearly the whole shore-line of its little attendant "jewel," Van Diemen's Land.

Africa and Australia.

Among these discoverers, Park gave not only his time and energy, but his life for the cause that claimed him. To increase our knowledge of the highly dangerous, unhealthy, and important region to be opened up he had first journeyed from Pisania on the Gambia to Sego on the Niger, descending the river to Silla, and returning to the coast by a more southerly route through the Mandingo country; but on his second journey he fell a victim to hostile natives near Boussa, and thus fulfilled his promise to Lord Camden that if he could not follow the course of the mighty stream he was exploring to the sea, he would "at least die on the Niger."

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY. The Established Church, 1715-1815.

THE history of the Church of England in the eighteenth century is proverbially dull. As a church, it never seemed more ashamed of itself; as an estate of the realm, it ceased to hold its representative assembly: as a religious force it saw itself distanced by Nonconforming agencies; as an establishment, it became steadily more inadequate.

It could not be denied that during the century that followed the Restoration the Church of England had the main direction of English religion, yet, in 1751, the greatest of her clergy, Bishop Butler, of Durham, bemoaned a "general decay of religion in the nation which is now observed by every one." The influence of Christianity, he declares, is more and more "wearing out of the minds of men." Dissent, which, in 1700, did not number more than one-twentieth of the English people, was supposed, by 1800, to include fully one-fifth, and the churchmanship of the remaining four-fifths was almost less than nominal. For religious movement and interest we must go, as everyone knows, to agencies represented by the Wesleyans or the Evangelicals, which issued in separation from the Church, or, at the least, in a practical rejection of her distinctive teaching.

Church and State.

First of all the political or external history of the Church in the eighteenth century must be taken, apart from the internal or social, or from that highly-developed branch of modern theology, the controversial. Never before or since, perhaps,

has the separation been more clearly defined between the outward and the inward life of the Church of England, between its Whiggery in high places and its intense Toryism in the mass, between the dignity and wealth of its prelates and the degradation of its lower clergy.

On the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty a number of clergy had declined the oaths, and so separated themselves from the Establishment (IV., pp. 509, 531). A much larger number, headed by Bishop Atterbury, of Rochester, accepted the new Government, but only as a parliamentary settlement, which they might induce Parliament itself to abrogate. These "Jacobite" clergy continued to offer, till 1722, an opposition which called itself constitutional, and seemed at any rate within the bounds of Tory churchmanship. Thus they opposed the "Act for strengthening the Protestant interest," of December, 1718, which proposed the repeal of the Act against Occasional Conformity, of the Schism Act, and of some parts of the Test and Corporation Acts: and they resisted with still greater energy the Quakers' Affirmation Bill, brought into the Lords in January, 1722, and allowing an indulgence, as Atterbury outrageously said, "to a set of people who were hardly Christians." But, in 1722, the "Jacobite" leader fell under the shadow of treason. Since August, 1717, he had been in constant correspondence with the exiled family; this was suspected by, if not thoroughly known to, Walpole; and, as Atterbury would not be bribed with a pension of £5,000 a year and the reversion of Winchester, he was arrested August 22nd, 1722, on a charge of three treasonable letters to the Earl of Mar, James's Secretary of State. The Government proceeded against him in Parliament by a Bill of Pains and Penalties; he was condemned to be deprived of his two benefices, the See of Rochester and the Deanery of Westminster, and to be banished for life.* From this time Jacobitism of the clerical type died out rapidly, and when the young Pretender entered England in 1745 he got scarcely any of the encouragement he looked for from the Church. Meantime, after the silencing of Convocation in 1717 as the result of the "Bangorian" Controversy, the selection of

The Jacobite Clergy.

* He died in Paris, still in the communion of the English Church, in March, 1732.

men for the government of the clergy under the State was carefully regulated by the political sovereign, as it had been regulated under the Tudors.

The Closing of Convocation.

Convocation had been prorogued in the summer of 1717, not to meet again till 1852, because it had dared to censure the theology of a friend of the Government. Bishop Hoadly, of Bangor, in his "Preservative against the Principles of the Non-jurors," and in his sermon, preached before King George I., March 17th, 1717, had denied the existence of any visible Church; the Lower House of Convocation on May 10th of the same year unanimously condemned his utterances as subversive of all government in the Church; but before the bishops could declare themselves, the clerical Parliament was prorogued, and kept in a state of suspended animation for 135 years. All inconvenient independence being thus taken away from the spiritualty, the Whig administration was able to keep a sufficient hold over the Church by making Whiggery a *sine quâ non* for high church office. Thus, in 1737, on the death of Archbishop Wake, Gibson of London, who had for years been the ecclesiastical adviser of Walpole, and was admittedly the most learned and statesmanlike of the prelates, but who had opposed the Ministers' Quaker Relief Bill, and procured its rejection by the Lords, was passed over for Potter of Oxford. Ten years later Herring, of York, succeeded Potter in the primacy, simply on the strength of unblemished loyalty to political and religious Whiggism; and the same were the credentials of Gibson's successor, Sherlock of Salisbury, in the See of London, and of most of the bishops appointed during the eighteenth century.

Politics and the Church.

It might have been expected from this long continuance of liberalising prelates, that something would have been done to modify the Prayer Book and reconcile the Dissenters. But the great principle of the English Government in dealing with Church matters, from Walpole to Wellington, was to let well alone, provided the Church itself showed no unpleasant signs of activity, and to this, for instance, was due the defeat of the Anti-Subscription movement. To the same instinct, aided by the vigorous opposition of the prelates, was owing the loss of the Dissenters' Relief Bill, brought before Parliament in 1773.

However, in 1778, the Roman Catholics were relieved from some of the most severe of the provisions of the penal laws, and, in 1779, the Dissenters' Relief Bill was re-introduced and carried. But the toleration shown to "Papists" led immediately to the Gordon Riots of 1780; and the attempts, in 1787, 1789 and 1790, to procure the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts were not successful. The outbreak of the French Revolution delayed any further progress in this direction for nearly forty years (p. 370), except as regards the Roman Catholics; who, suffering as they now did in France, gained a deal of sympathy in England, and were again relieved in 1791, being exempted from the penal statutes still unrepealed, on condition of taking an oath of allegiance (p. 369).

Theological Controversies.

But, significantly enough, the main feature of Church history in the eighteenth century is controversy. The prominent and successful churchman of this age is the keen pamphleteer, and it seemed more important to argue about the most abstract theological and metaphysical subtleties than to attend to any part of the practical life of the Church. The result of this polemical mania was in the highest degree disastrous to religion, which now seemed to be losing its force and attraction just in proportion to its disputatiousness.

The Bangorian Controversy.

The first of these controversies was the Bangorian, which has been already noticed as the direct cause of the suspension of Convocation. But there was another interest about this: for it brought into notice one of the most gifted religious writers who have ever found a home in the Church of England—William Law, the author of the "Serious Call," whose "Letters to the Bishop of Bangor" (Hoadly) were, perhaps, the ablest essays of the century in religious controversy.

The Latitudinarians.

The Latitudinarian attack did not cease with the end of Hoadly's original campaign, but it gradually divided itself into two branches; one party advised liberal theologians to disregard the difficulties of subscription to Church doctrines, and to stay in and "leaven the mass"; the other urged the removal of the doctrinal tests. Dr. Samuel Clarke, the moralist (IV., p. 566) rector of St. James', Westminster, is often considered as the founder of the former school, so unconsciously satirised

by an Eastern prince, who learnt from it to escape the difficulties of his own religion. ("I take them like my Christian friends take theirs. I say I believe in Buddha, but I don't.") Clarke's "Reformed Prayer Book and Collection of Psalms and Hymns," published in 1718, practically furnished the Arian churchmen with a suitable liturgy for use in a Trinitarian Church; and the editor explained away any scruples that might be felt by the assurance that "every person may reasonably agree to forms imposed by Protestant communities whenever he can, in any sense at all, reconcile them with Scripture." Naturally, this position was hard pressed both from the side of the Dissenters and from that of the orthodox churchmen, by the author of the "Address to the Conforming Clergy" as well as by Daniel Waterland. The latter's "Case of Arian Subscription Considered" (1721) opened a wordy warfare, which, at last, led to most of the leaders of the "complaisant Arians" resigning their preferments, and joining in the second great attempt of the Broad School in this age, the Anti-Subscription movement. One of the earliest steps in this direction, after the accession of the House of Hanover, was a volume of essays published in 1749 under the title of "Free and Candid Disquisitions Relating to the Church of England," and attacks on these were vigorously met by one who now became the leader of the Anti-Subscription party, though he had no hand in the Disquisitions—Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland. It seems remarkable that no permanent result followed these efforts, for the views of their promoters were in favour in the highest quarters. It was Archbishop Hutton of York who presented Blackburne to his Archdeaconry; and Herring, who was translated from the northern to the southern primacy in 1747, was warm in his approval of such works as Clarke's "Prayer Book" and Hoadly's "Plain Account of the Lord's Supper" (1733). In 1750 Bishop Clayton of Clogher, in his "Essay on Spirit," pressed for the omission of the Athanasian Creed and a general review of the Prayer Book, and the whole principle of subscription to formularies was unsparingly attacked by Blackburne in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (1754) as the cause of the bad morality of the nation and the inefficiency of the clergy. In his main work, the "Confessional," published in 1766,

Blackburne follows up the same line, denies that any general assent to Church doctrine as a whole can be accepted as honest, and proceeds to denounce all confessions of faith as terms of qualification for office.

On the accession of Archbishop Cornwallis, in 1768, the Anti-Subscriptionists presented "Proposals for Relief in the Matter of Subscription" (1771), and brought these before the House of Commons, February 6th, 1772. Scarcely more than 200 persons had signed it, but such important people as Bishop Law, Dr. Paley, and Dr. Watson were in sympathy with its principle, though too cautious to commit themselves. The Commons rejected the proposals (or rather the motion to consider them) by 217 against 71, and Burke contemptuously described the petitioners as men who "want to receive the emoluments appropriated for teaching one set of doctrines while they are teaching another."

A second memorial to the same effect presented to Archbishop Cornwallis in 1772 likewise failed to produce any effect, and, as the Evangelical and Methodist revival was now beginning to be very deeply felt, the interest in the Anti-Subscription movement slackened, for the Revivalists regarded this whole development as an attack upon the essential Christian beliefs under the guise of Liberality.

The Deists.

The Deistical controversy proper belongs more, perhaps, to the eighteenth century philosophy than to religion. But, in a great measure, it was an attack upon the formal creed of the Church, and as such we must notice Anthony Collins's "Discourse on the Grounds of the Christian Religion" (1724), Woolston's "Discourses on the Miracles of Christ" (1727) (answered by Sherlock's "Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection"), and Tindal's "Christianity as Old as the Creation," devoted to proving that a religion of nature is all that man requires (IV., p. 566).

It was especially to answer these criticisms that Joseph Butler, while Rector of Stanhope, composed his "Analogy of Religion," published in 1736, and that Berkeley wrote his "Dialogues of Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher" (pp. 42, 43). But with Hume (p. 240) the ground of the controversy passed beyond Deism to more fundamental scepticism. His tenth Essay (on Miracles) was met at the time by

John Leland, in his "View of Deistical Writers," issued in the very year that saw the publication of Lord Bolingbroke's posthumous works (1754), which rejected "every opinion that would embarrass a Sceptic arguing with a Christian." Of the philosophical side of this controversy, now concerned with those first principles which underlie the fundamental disposition of the human mind for or against supernatural beliefs, some account will be found elsewhere (pp. 240, 413).

The "Hutchinsonians," Jones of Nayland (the original founder of the "British Critic"), and George Horne, Bishop of Norwich, with their sympathisers, were perhaps the most important defenders of religious principle in this philosophical struggle, as Hume had been the most prominent, Gibbon the most subtle, Priestley * (p. 244) the most moderate, and Tom Paine the most outrageous among the Rationalistic champions.

Social Life of the Clergy.

The social history of the Church during this time is especially interesting from the abundant material that remains to prove the almost incredible subservience and degradation of many of the lower clergy at this time. But it can only be summarised here.

Among the usages that pressed most heavily upon the clergy was their dependence on lay patrons as enforced by "bonds of resignation," whose true meaning was declared by Archbishop Secker to be only to "enslave the incumbent to the will and pleasure of his patron." † But whatever the grievances of incumbents, those of the assistant clergy were much worse. Before the French Revolution their income was settled by the bishops at some figure which could not exceed £50. The wealthy curate only began with the Act 36th of George III., which fixed the maximum at £75, and legislation for the Church at this time meant, as Sydney Smith declared, legislation for the bishops. The pluralities and non-residence of the higher clergy were as great a scandal as the pauperising and social degradation of the lower. While a deanery or canonry was regularly annexed to certain sees, and in other cases added to reward a new

* In his "History of the Corruption of Christianity" (1782) and "History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ" (1786).

† These bonds, however, were disallowed by the House of Lords in 1782.

bishop for his self-denial in resigning a comfortable living (as was the case even in the distinguished instances of Atterbury, Butler, and Henry Philpotts), the country parsons were, as a rule, scarcely above the social state pictured by Fielding for his Parson Adams, and by Goldsmith for his Vicar of Wakefield. The ordinary wife for the poorer country parson was a servant or an innkeeper's daughter. Still more servile was the state of the domestic chaplains. For their position was literally that of a servant, and not of the head servant either, in power or perquisites (IV., pp. 359, 608), where, for instance, the butler had a very solid advantage. Local customs often survived into the present century to prove this singular condition of things. In Cumberland it was long the fashion for the parish priest to take his knife and fork and go the round of the farmers of his district, boarding with each for a week as part of his stipend.

Most luckless of all were the half-starved clergy who could get no appointment; and Oldham's bitter satire complains that there were plenty of these in the earlier part of the century:—

> "You'll hardly meet
> More porters now than parsons in the street;
> And half the number of the sacred herd
> Is fain to stroll and wander unpreferred."

The lowest point of the religious life of the century was reached in the later years of Walpole's ministry. From this time began the great revival of the Wesleys, of Whitefield, and of the Methodists and the Evangelicals.

The Wesleyan and Evangelical Movements.

The Wesleyan movement has been dealt with elsewhere (p. 237). Its chief effect upon the Church of England was twofold—a shock and a revival, the loss of many of her most earnest people, the gain of the new life given to her by the Evangelicals of the later part of the century, whose leaders—Wilberforce, Simeon, Toplady, Venn, Newton, Cowper, and the Milners—were rather followers of Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists than of Wesley himself. It was they, as has been said, who began to make the fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector at last impossible. "In the nation at large" they brought about "a new moral enthusiasm which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was healthy in its

social tone, and whose power was seen" in the lessening of the "profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes, and the foulness which had infested literature, ever since the Restoration." A yet nobler result of the same movement was the revival of the spirit of mercy and kindness, and the new attempts "to remedy the ignorance, the physical suffering, and the social degradation" of the outcast and the poor. "The Sunday schools established by Raikes of Gloucester at the close of the century were the beginnings of popular education. By writings and by her own personal example, Hannah More drew the sympathy of England to the poverty and crime of the agricultural labourer. A passionate impulse of human sympathy with the wronged and afflicted" was the special glory of religion at the end of the eighteenth century, and it has a right to claim the honour of training and inspiring those uncanonized yet true saints—Wilberforce, Clarkson, and John Howard.

The High Church Party.

Lastly, in the persons of such men as Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man; Bishop Jebb, of Limerick; and Alexander Knox, the High Church movement of the nineteenth century had its forerunners, a link between the fervent but irregular Sacramentalism of John Wesley and the Oxford Tractarians of 1833–45.

Beginning of Church Schools.

Similarly, in the foundation of the National Society for the Education of the Poor in 1811 we have the first definite step towards the present system of Church schools. But at the close of this period (1815) the Church as an institution was scarcely ever upheld on higher ground than that of Bishop Porteous in his last charge—"An ancient and venerable *establishment*, constructed by some of the wisest, most pious, and most eminent men of any period." The more active and aggressive thought among the Churchmen of this time now usually took the form of a Calvinism so rigid and so morbid, so complacent and often so bitter as to show a curious contrast to the practical excellence of life which it largely succeeded in producing. Thus Simeon, towards the end of his life, declared himself so corrupt that he could only wonder at being still kept out of hell. Henry Venn congratulates his son on the opposition of the Huntingtonians, for "their hatred is

much to be preferred to their praise." Toplady, in 1772, addresses his spiritual father, a man twice his age, with all the violence of a "bold young man," as the victim of his attack coolly described him. "Time, sir," he writes to John Wesley, "has already whitened your locks, and the hour must shortly come which will transmit you to the tribunal of that God on whose sovereignty the greater part of your life has been one continued assault." Still more scurrilous were his rhymes on the supposed intention of Wesley to raise a persecution against the Calvinists. This plot, as fabulous as the "Popish" of Charles II.'s day, is told in the form of a fable:—

"There's a fox who resideth hard by,
The most perfect and holy and sly
That ever turned coat, or did pilfer or lie.

"As this reverend Reynard one day
Sat thinking what game best to play,
Satan came by, a brief visit to pay.

"'Oh, your servant, my friend,' quoth the priest;
'Though you carry the mark of the beast,
I never shook paws with a welcomer guest.'

"'Many thanks, holy man,' cried the fiend;
'It's because you're my very good friend
That I came by, with you a few minutes to spend.'"

By the side of these Evangelical controversies, the old technical High Church disputes lost their interest, and for a time it even appeared probable that the Church in the colonies would be altogether left to shift without "Bishoply government," as useless and possibly dangerous. The Nonjurors tried to revive the use of King Edward VI.'s First Prayer Book, but the appeal to "Catholic antiquity" fell unheeded; the "regular" Nonjurors became extinct* in 1779, and the last of the "irregular bishops" died in Ireland in 1805.

Extinction of the Nonjurors.

On the other hand, through the consecration of Samuel Seabury by the Scotch Episcopate as Bishop of Connecticut on November 14th, 1784, the American Church was organically linked with the mother Church of England, as some of the Latitudinarians had feared, and as few Churchmen at the

* After a lively flirtation with the Russian Church in 1720–22, like that of Archbishop Wake with the Gallicans in 1618.

time thought necessary. It seems to have been looked on as a piece of pedantic ecclesiasticism by most, but it perhaps was the first clear sign of the modern reaction within the Church from apology to confidence, from a defence of its institutions as not absolutely bad to a proclaiming of their superiority over all "independent" forms of Christianity.

T. WHITTAKER. Philosophy.

HUME'S sceptical conclusions were not long in stirring up reaction against the Cartesian and Lockian principles that had led to them. The chief exponent of this reaction was Thomas Reid (1710–96), the founder of what is known as the Scottish school of philosophy. Reid's reply to Hume, the "Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense," appeared in 1764; his "Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man," in 1785; "Essays on the Active Powers of Man," 1788. By the French "spiritualist" school of Cousin and Jouffroy, Reid's appeal to "common sense" was taken up as the watchword of their own reaction against the development in France of Locke's principles. Credit is now usually allowed to Reid for seeing the true historical genesis of Berkeley's idealism and of Hume's scepticism. His own philosophical doctrine has been called by disciples "natural realism." He holds that in perception we have direct knowledge of objects. Sensations serve only as signs to perception. The mind originally possesses certain judgments, of which we become conscious by intuition. It is these that Reid calls "principles of common sense." Their existence is to be established by internal observation; hence the importance of psychology in Reid's view. On the study of psychology, it is admitted by some who do not think very highly of his general philosophy, Reid had a favourable influence.

The Scottish School: Reid.

"Natural Realism."

Among the ethical writers of the period, William Paley (1743–1805), in his "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy" (1785), gave the clearest possible expression to the doctrine known as "theological utilitarianism." For this doctrine, the end of the individual man is his own happiness. The means of attaining happiness

Paley's Ethics.

is to obey the command of God, reward being attached to obedience, punishment to disobedience. To know by the light of reason whether an action is in accordance with the will of God, we have to find out whether it is conducive to general happiness—for this is what man is commanded to promote. In his "Natural Theology, or Evidence of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity Collected from the Appearances of Nature" (1802), Paley sets forth what is known as the design-argument for theism, taking his stand especially upon human anatomy.

Bentham's Ethics.

The ethical doctrine of Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) was utilitarianism without theology. Bentham's greatness was most of all in the theory of legislation. So far as the political ideas are concerned within which his legislative theory is circumscribed, he may be said to descend from Hobbes and Hume. About his relation to Hume there is no doubt, for he himself refers to Hume's "Treatise" as supplying the refutation of the theory that political society took its origin from an original contract. And this rejection of the original contract is combined in Bentham with an assertion, essentially identical with that of Hobbes, that the supreme power in the State, wherever it may be placed, is absolute. These two positions are at the ground of Bentham's "Fragment on Government" (1776), which is an attack on Blackstone's view of the English Constitution as consisting in an arrangement of checks and balances. The constitutional doctrine was worked out by Blackstone in relation to a kind of contract theory; and it was, of course, likewise, a continuation of those doctrines of limited monarchy which Hobbes had attacked when they were put forth by the lawyers of his time. Having thus cleared away the old constructions and prepared the foundation, Bentham goes to work with assumptions of his own. The legislator need no longer trouble himself about fictitious "rights" of rulers and ruled against each other, but must take for his end "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," and make such laws, both criminal and civil, as will best promote this end. His general formula for this end Bentham adopted from Priestley. Happiness he proceeds to analyse into pleasures and absence of pains, regarding it as a kind of algebraical sum in which pleasures count as

positive and pains as negative. From his conception of the end thus analysed he begins to work out practical rules in his "Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation" (printed 1780, published 1789). Bentham's later writings, which are very extensive, were for the most part put into shape not by himself but by disciples, who took over from him the masses of manuscript he had a way of accumulating on each particular subject. The expositions of Dumont were of special service in diffusing Bentham's ideas on the Continent.

Bentham's Political Influence.

To Bentham's political influence, which dates from the early years of the present century, full justice has probably never yet been done. Exercised especially through James Mill and the other "philosophical Radicals," such as Grote and Molesworth, it was equally present, though in a more qualified form, in Whigs like Macaulay and Sydney Smith. The members of Bentham's school derived their political theory in part directly from Hobbes, but new application was given to it in accordance with Bentham's own doctrine. Bentham's later political, as distinguished from legislative, deduction from his general positions, was to affirm "representative democracy" as the only form of government which in modern times can be trusted to promote the interests of the whole. The government of one or of a few will always try to promote its own interests at the expense of the community; and all mixed forms of government are necessarily unstable. "Balance of power" within a single State, if it means anything, means that the constitution has been made unworkable. Utilitarianism, of course, remains here the principle, and it is worthy of note that, both early and late, Bentham vehemently rejected the doctrine of "natural rights."

Science.

At the end of the section on science in the last chapter Cavendish's theory of electricity was referred to. Henry Cavendish (1731–1810) is our greatest name among the chemists and physicists of this period. Along with Black, he is one of the founders of chemistry as a quantitative science. In all the lines of investigation to which he paid attention, the exactitude of his work gave it special value during the formative period of the newer physical studies.

Physics and Chemistry: Cavendish.

Cavendish's theory of electricity was thought out in relation to the newly-discovered phenomena of induction. He had communicated it to the Royal Society before the publication by Æpinus of his "Tentamen Theoriæ Electricitatis et Magnetismi" (1759), but had delayed its publication. Having become aware of Æpinus's similar theory, he at length published his own in 1771, finding that, although he had been anticipated, he had carried the theory further than Æpinus. Both Æpinus and Cavendish proceed on the supposition of a single fluid with mutually repellent particles. Cavendish inclines to the true supposition as regards electrical attraction and repulsion—that they are forces varying inversely as the square of the distance.

The Decomposition of Water.

By an application of electricity to chemical experiment, Cavendish proved water to be a compound. This discovery was published in the "Philosophical Transactions" of 1784–5. Oxygen and hydrogen ("dephlogisticated air" and "inflammable air" as they were then called) were mixed in various proportions and exploded in a close vessel by means of the electric spark. It was found that when they were mixed in a certain proportion the product of the explosion was pure water, and that water was also formed when a mixture of hydrogen and common air was exploded. In this last case the bulk of the air was diminished by about one-fifth, which corresponds to the amount of oxygen contained in the atmosphere. Thus water and atmospheric air were conclusively proved not to be simple bodies. In the same series of papers ("Experiments on Air") in the "Philosophical Transactions," the composition of nitric acid was established. This discovery had been prepared for by experiments of Priestley, in which he showed that the condition of common air is altered by the transmission of electric sparks.

Cavendish, like Priestley, though his discoveries had so important a part in overthrowing the theory of phlogiston, remained an adherent of that theory. He was, however, not quite so uncompromising an adherent as Priestley. And, though retaining phlogiston, he denied to heat the character of a substance, regarding Bacon's opinion "that heat consists in the internal motion of the particles of bodies" as "much the most probable."

In this period geology passes from the stage of description and collection to the beginnings of systematic theory. Geological specimens, particularly organic fossils, had long since excited curiosity and suggested speculations about past states of the earth during which there had been a different distribution of land and sea. Among the early modern speculations, those of the Italians were the most noteworthy. In 1695 William Woodward had founded his geological museum. This he bequeathed to the University of Cambridge, at the same time founding and endowing a professorship of geology. The construction of geological maps was proposed to the Royal Society by Dr. Lister, in 1683, and an example of a chart of the kind was published by Dr. Christopher Packe in 1743; but the idea was only that each portion of a country should be distinguished according to its soil or its predominant mineral. So far there was no thought of division into strata. The initiation of scientific geology in England was reserved for James Hutton and William Smith.

Geology.

James Hutton (1726–97) was born at Edinburgh, and, like so many who contributed to the advancement of science at that time, qualified as a physician. Finding no opening in medicine, he took to agriculture. By his taste for chemistry he was led to the study of mineralogy. During journeys in Holland, Belgium, and the north of France, he began to study the surface of the earth and to speculate about its history. In 1768 he retired from practical farming, and devoted himself thenceforth to working out his ideas about the origin of rocks and minerals. In 1785 he communicated his views to the newly-established Royal Society of Edinburgh, in a paper entitled "Theory of the Earth, or an Investigation of the Laws Observable in the Composition, Dissolution, and Restoration of Land upon the Globe." The "Theory of the Earth" was re-published in an extended form in 1795. To the diffusion of Hutton's ideas his friend John Playfair, Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh, contributed much by his "Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory of the Earth" (1802). Playfair had the gift of luminous exposition, in which Hutton was somewhat wanting.

James Hutton.

From Hutton's ideas the geological doctrine known as uniformitarianism took its origin. According to this doctrine,

the present state of the earth, and in particular the distribution of its rocks, is to be explained entirely by causes in kind and degree resembling those that are in action to-day. The present rocks, in Hutton's view, have been formed out of the waste of older rocks. The materials were laid down beneath the sea, consolidated under great pressure, and afterwards disrupted and upheaved by the expansive force of subterraneous heat. Molten rock was injected into the rents of the dislocated strata. The upheaved land, exposed to the atmosphere, is subject to decay, and the process of decay will not cease till the whole is again laid down on the sea floor, whence the consolidated sediment will be raised into new land by new upheavals. Geology is not cosmogony, but is concerned entirely with these alternate changes, beyond which it has evidence neither of a beginning nor of an end.

The Uniformitarian Theory.

William Smith (1769–1839) was born at Churchill, in Oxfordshire, and became a mineral surveyor and civil engineer. From an early age his scientific curiosity had been drawn to the stratification of the earth; and in the course of his professional work he had opportunities of observing and comparing the strata of various districts. In his "Order of the Strata, and their Embedded Organic Remains, in the Neighbourhood of Bath" (1799), he at length put forward the scientific principle which had long been in his mind, and which his observations had gone to confirm. This principle was the identification of strata by the fossils they contain. Working by this principle, he was able to prove that there is a settled order of succession among the strata. After spending another period of several years in collecting and arranging data, he published his large "Geological Map of England and Wales, with part of Scotland," in 1815. Separate county geological maps were published later, constituting, when formed into a whole, the "Geological Atlas of England and Wales."

William Smith.

Though some previous geologists, both in England and on the Continent, had suggested views about fossils having some resemblance to those of Smith, his idea was developed quite independently; and he succeeded in carrying it further than anyone before him. At this stage of geological progress, the way was prepared for Cuvier and others, who, from sufficient

knowledge of comparative anatomy, were able to prove that there are fossil animals of different species from any that now exist. To make possible a science of palæontology, the work of many generations of naturalists and anatomists had, of course, been necessary. Among those who contributed to this work may be mentioned John Hunter (1728–93), the famous surgeon. Hunter had anatomised over five hundred different species of animals. He had himself correct ideas about the nature of fossils, and recognised the importance of water as an agent in terrestrial changes.

The Beginnings of Palæontology.

Wider biological speculations now begin to appear. Erasmus Darwin, in his "Zoonomia" (1794–96), put forth the opinion that species are evolved from one another, not separately created. On the causes of evolution he speculated in the spirit of his French successor Lamarck. Thus he cannot be said to have anticipated the distinctive theory of his more famous grandson, by which, in our own time, the doctrine of evolution has been established to the satisfaction of all naturalists. Instead of supposing transmutation of species to take place by the accumulation of "spontaneous" variations —that is, variations which are innate and of which the causes are not definitely assignable—he set out from the observation that the use of parts and organs causes them to develop, while disuse causes them to diminish or disappear; changes thus initiated, he went on to suppose, are transmitted to offspring, and, if the same external conditions continue, are accumulated in succeeding generations, so that at length a form is arrived at so different as to constitute a new species.

THE period embraced by the years 1742 to 1802 was a momentous one for the science as well as for the art of medicine. With the exception of John Huxham and William Heberden the elder, there were no really great physicians in England in the year 1742. Sir Hans Sloane, who had then recently retired from the office of President of the Royal Society, was rather a man of high scientific attainments than a pure physician, whilst Cullen's reputation was gained wholly in Scotland.

D'ARCY POWER. Medicine.

A Surgical Revolution.

The surgeons were associated with the barbers as a City Company, which had existed since the days of Henry VIII. The only legitimate road to surgical practice in London and within seven miles of the City lay through the portals of this company. The Society of Apothecaries, another City company which had developed in the reign of James I. as an offshoot from the Grocers' Company, provided a subordinate order of medical practitioners, but the Apothecaries' Society was itself very much under the control of the College of Physicians, who were apt to press their privileges with undue harshness. The social status of the physicians at this time was good—that of the surgeons was not yet defined. The condition of the apothecaries, and of the members of the Scotch Colleges who were then swarming into England, is revealed to us in Smollett's novels. It was as low as it well could be.

Medicine consisted of empirical knowledge based upon an incorrect pathology. Surgery of the rudest description had its foundations in a very shallow knowledge of anatomy. The Barber-Surgeons' Company did its best to teach anatomy and surgery by a series of public lectures and demonstrations, delivered by the most eminent and practical men of the time, but the difficulty experienced in procuring subjects for dissection rendered anatomy theoretical rather than practical. Midwifery was chiefly in the hands of women, and the true mechanism of a normal labour was not known to more than two or three men in England.

Such was the condition of medicine in 1742: in 1750 everything had changed. The College of Physicians indeed maintained for some time longer its supine attitude, but in 1745 the surgeons, poor and penniless, seceded in a body from the Company of Barber-Surgeons. They were reconstituted as the Surgeons' Company. John Ranby, the King's Serjeant-Surgeon, was chosen the first Master, with Cheselden as one of the Wardens. The new company was founded very much upon the lines of the united company, but its members had fewer expenses, and they were allowed the liberty of private teaching. The company soon acquired a hall in the Old Bailey, but as the barbers, with a few trifling exceptions, retained the whole of the revenues belonging to the united company, the Surgeons'

The Surgeons.

Company had to depend upon various extraneous sources of income. These were badly managed, and in 1780 the company was almost insolvent owing to the bankruptcy of its clerk, to whom it had incautiously advanced money. A new clerk, of approved business capacity, was appointed, and for a short time the progress of the company was satisfactory. It soon fell back into its former condition, however, and in 1789 its Master complained to the members that "your theatre is without lectures, your library a room without books, is converted into an office for your clerk, and your committee-room is become his parlour. It is not always used even in your common business, and, when it is thus made use of, it is seldom in a fit and proper state." It is no wonder if this scandalous state of affairs led to disaster. The more active and radical members of the profession used the degraded condition of the company to "point a moral and adorn a tale." At length the Corporation found that it had destroyed itself by the illegal holding of a meeting to elect Mr. Cline its Master for the year 1796. An endeavour was made to reconstruct the company upon its old basis, but the opposition was too strong, and the Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords at its second reading, on 17th July, 1797. It was then determined, after much discussion, that the company should be revived by a Charter from the Crown rather than by an Act of Parliament. This Charter was granted on 20th March, 1800, to a new body called the Royal College of Surgeons in London. It gave the College extensive privileges in London, but it has since been amended in several important particulars, and the institution has been called since 1843 the "Royal College of Surgeons of England."

Nothing, perhaps, is more remarkable in the medical history of this period than the rise in the social position of the surgeon. The surgeon had always been subordinate to the physician, for in early days the physician was usually an ecclesiastic whilst the surgeon was a layman, who performed operations at the command of the physician. This position of inferiority was maintained until quite recently. The College of Physicians procured an Order of Council in June, 1632, with a clause that no chirurgeon "doe either dismember (*i.e.* amputate), Trepan the head, open the Chest or Belly, cut for the stone, or doe any great operation but in the presence

of a learned physitian"; and there are persons still alive who remember the time when a surgeon's prescription in a hospital had to be countersigned by the physician before it could be dispensed if it was for more than a black draught. It was only the energetic protests of Abernethy, at the beginning of this century, which led to the surgeon gaining a complete control over his own patient. From time immemorial a few surgeons who were not barbers existed in London, and perhaps in the other large towns in England. In London they formed a guild or confraternity of surgeons from 1354 until they were united with the Barbers' Company in 1540. The numbers of this guild were few, not more than ten or fifteen at any one time, but they maintained the reputation of surgery, and its members appear to have been held in higher social estimation than the surgeons who were also barbers. The members of the united Company of Barbers and Surgeons never held a high social position; even Clowes and Gale, Banister and Woodall, the great surgeons of the end of Elizabeth's reign, never occupied a position at all comparable to that held by Caius, Butts, Harvey, or Theodore de Mayerne. The mere union of the surgeons with barbers sometimes led to troublesome mistakes, for it became impossible to ascertain officially who was a barber and who practised surgery. The succession of great surgeons, Cheselden, Pott, and Hunter, and the formation of a Corporation of Surgeons apart from barbers, removed the stigma, and by the end of the eighteenth century the best surgeons occupied as good a position socially as the best physicians.

Lectures in Surgery.

The members of the Surgeons' Company soon availed themselves to the uttermost of their liberty to teach. Percivall Pott began to deliver lectures at his house in Watling Street in the year 1747. They were private at the outset, being intended solely for the students who followed his surgical practice in the neighbouring hospital of St. Bartholomew. They were given at first with hesitation and reserve, but as the lecturer gained confidence his style improved, and the course eventually became so celebrated that all the most distinguished English practitioners of surgery and many foreign ones boasted themselves his pupils. John Hunter himself was an auditor in 1751.

Midwifery.

The reform of midwifery in England is due to William Smellie and to James Douglas, the friend of the Hunters. Smellie, who had been a humble practitioner in Lanarkshire, settled as an apothecary in Pall Mall about 1739. He had spent a short time in France, and had there imbibed the spirit of the younger Grégoire's teaching. This teaching he reproduced in London in an improved form, and with such success that the battle of man-midwifery raged round him for many years. The men conquered, and their obstetric art is now based upon the best kind of knowledge, a thorough acquaintance with normal conditions.

John Hunter and Pathology.

Pathology, or the science of the cause of disease, did not exist in the first half of the eighteenth century. Morbid anatomy itself, which is the basis of pathology, was as yet hardly known. Post-mortem examinations, indeed, were made, but the results were neither recorded nor tabulated, unless in exceptional cases. The medical profession knew but little of the normal appearances met with in dead bodies; it is not surprising, therefore, that they made no advance in the knowledge of abnormal appearances. The genius of one man—John Hunter—created English pathology, and took it at once almost to the highest position, for he fortified it with clinical, anatomical, and experimental observations which are unassailable when they are combined.

John Hunter was in some respects even more remarkable than William, his elder brother. He possessed greater singleness of purpose, and therefore greater concentration, greater depth of knowledge, greater determination, and that minute attention to detail associated with the power of generalisation which only coexist in the highest intellects. The minds of the two brothers in many respects were strikingly alike. Both had a mania for collecting. William accumulated the large museum which is at present housed in Glasgow. It was begun to illustrate his lectures, but it was not limited to anatomical preparations, for it contains an art department, books, coins, and specimens of natural history. John Hunter's museum, on the other hand, is severely scientific, but it is unique. It has long had the good fortune to be cared for by the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and it is magnificently housed in Lincoln's Inn Fields. The systematic

teaching of medicine and surgery to students we owe in great measure to William Hunter. He established a small school to instruct a "Society of Naval Surgeons." The lectures were originally the continuation of a series delivered by Samuel Sharp, surgeon to Guy's Hospital. Hunter delivered his first course in 1746, at the house of his friend, Dr. James Douglas, in the Piazza, Covent Garden. This course proved to be the starting-point of regular instruction in every branch of medical science. The Hunterian or Great Windmill Street School of Medicine developed from it, and with varying fortunes continued until 1831. The first course of lectures resulted in a gain to Hunter of seventy guineas, a sum which he showed gleefully to his friends, saying that it was the first time he had seen so much gold. The school prospered exceedingly, and when Matthew Baillie, the Hunters' nephew, retired from its management at the end of the century, he received no less than £4,000 for his share in the goodwill. The success of the Hunterian school led in part to the multiplication of improved methods of teaching in England, and before the end of the century the outlines of medical education were fixed, and, with certain necessary modifications, are still carried out as William Hunter left them.

Medical Schools.

The medical schools attached to the hospitals also attained a greater prominence during the later years of the eighteenth century. They began at St. Bartholomew's and at St. Thomas's Hospitals about 1680, where the surgeons took pupils, or "cubs," whom they instructed in their art. No attempt, however, seems to have been made to give these pupils more than instruction at the bedside until Pott began to lecture. Clinical instruction in physic was of still later origin, and was derived from Scotland, where it had been placed upon a satisfactory footing by Dr. Rutherford, Sir Walter Scott's grandfather, a physician to the Infirmary at Edinburgh.

The students appear to have done their best to make up for the deficiency of the official teaching which was given to them, for in every hospital to which a medical school was attached a debating society was formed. The idea of such a society appears to have begun in the hospitals of St. Thomas and of Guy, then united and situated side

by side in the Borough, almost on the site of what is now the London Bridge Railway Station. The Physical Society was inaugurated there in 1771. It died in 1852 after a useful career, but its traditions are still carried on by the daughter societies in the two hospitals, which are now separated. The Middlesex Hospital Society was founded in 1774, and still flourishes, whilst in 1795 the Abernethian Society, which has just celebrated its centenary, was founded in the Royal Hospital of St. Bartholomew. The other hospitals followed the example thus set them. The growth of the hospital debating societies was coincident with the growth of the more important medical societies for those who had completed their studies and were actually practising their profession. Of these the Medical Society of London is one of the oldest, as it is certainly one of the most flourishing. These societies have done much for the advancement of medicine as a science, for they have promoted free discussion, and have allowed a large number of carefully observed facts to be recorded in a form which is easily accessible to everyone.

Hospital Debating Societies.

The wave of philanthropy continued to rise throughout England in exact proportion to the increase in the material prosperity of the country. It took the very practical form of building hospitals and infirmaries for the gratuitous treatment of the sick. The London Hospital in Whitechapel began its useful existence in 1740 as a small infirmary in Featherstone Street. It was then moved to Prescott Street, Goodman's Fields, a neighbourhood inhabited then, as now, by a large Jewish population. Additional accommodation was soon required, and buildings were erected upon its present site in 1757. Every county town in England soon had its infirmary or local hospital. The York Hospital was founded in 1740, the Devon and Exeter a year later. The Newcastle-on-Tyne Royal Infirmary was established in 1751; the Leeds General Infirmary in 1767; the Radcliffe Infirmary at Oxford in 1770; the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital in 1771; and the Birmingham General Hospital in 1779. None were endowed; each had to be supported by the voluntary contributions of subscribers, who thus showed their genuine pity for the sick poor. It speaks well for the benevolence of Englishmen

Hospitals.

that none of these institutions, when once opened, have ever been allowed to close their doors for want of funds, but that through bad times and through good times money has always been forthcoming for their support.

Hygiene.

Hygiene, or the science of public health and preventive medicine, arose from small beginnings during the latter half of the eighteenth century. We owe its origin in part to Sir John Pringle, and in part to Sir Gilbert Blane. Sir John Pringle, in 1742, was physician to the Earl of Stair, then in command of the British army in Flanders. He was afterwards Physician-General to his Majesty's forces in the Low Countries, and eventually he became President of the Royal Society. Dr. Pringle published, in 1750, his "Observations on the Jail or Hospital Fever"; in 1752, the first edition of his "Observations on the Diseases of the Army"; and in 1783 an account of the method he had taken to preserve the health of the crew of his Majesty's ship *Resolution* during her voyage round the world under the command of Captain Cook (p. 225). Scurvy had been for many years the curse of the Navy, but Pringle's rules were so good, and Captain Cook interpreted them so successfully, that he performed a voyage of three years and eighteen days with a crew of 118 men through every variety of climate, and only lost one man. The use of "sweet-wort," a rigid attention to diet, cleanliness, and the careful preservation of his company from wet and other injuries of weather, formed the chief part of Cook's hygienic code.

Sanitation in the Army.

The condition of the sick and wounded in the Army was very bad at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The first improvement was introduced, doubtless at Pringle's suggestion, when the Earl of Stair proposed to the Duke of Noailles, in 1742, that the hospitals of the opposing forces should be considered as sanctuaries for the sick and should be mutually protected. This arrangement was approved, and was rigidly enforced during the campaign in the Low Countries. It had been usual, before this agreement was entered into, to remove the sick to a considerable distance from the camp upon the approach of the enemy. This necessarily called away the medical officers from the fighting line, and so led to the death of many men for want of timely aid and skilful assistance.

The good work begun by Pringle was ably carried out by Sir Gilbert Blane, who was first the physician to Lord Rodney's fleet, then a physician to St. Thomas' Hospital, and afterwards a commissioner to the Admiralty for the care of sick and wounded sailors. Sir Gilbert Blane made special arrangements for the provisioning of ships on foreign stations, and he was very particular that they should be supplied with an abundance of lemon-juice. He was also consulted on the subject of quarantine, the arrangement of hulks and some of the prisons on shore, as well as with respect to the transportation of convicts, on all of which his advice was conspicuously beneficial. The work of Pringle and Blane marks the beginning of a new science. Gaol fever is now unknown; the medical care of our soldiers has been copied by the other nations of Europe; our Navy is the most healthy in the world; and scurvy has disappeared even from our mercantile marine.

The birth of sanitary science, however, was not out of due time. The Black Assize at the Old Bailey, in April, 1750, is still remembered. The persons of chief note who were in court at the time, and who afterwards died of the fever contracted there, were the Lord Mayor, one of the justices of the Common Pleas, one of the barons of the Exchequer, one of the aldermen of London, a barrister, one of the under-sheriffs, two or three students, an officer of the Lord Chief Justice, several of the jury, and about forty other persons whom business or curiosity had brought thither. The condition of the prisons throughout the country, and, indeed, in Europe generally, was most deplorable (p. 483). Overcrowding was the real cause of these outbreaks of typhus, but the window-tax (IV., p. 521) had much to answer for. This tax was originally imposed in 1696, and, in 1710, houses with from twenty to thirty windows paid ten shillings, whilst those with more than thirty windows paid twenty shillings. It was replaced by the modern form of inhabited house duty, mainly in consequence of an agitation promoted by Mr. Reginald Orton, a surgeon living in Sunderland.

Public Health.

The public health during the second half of the eighteenth century was satisfactory, though it was not so good as it had been during the first part. Smallpox continued the prevalent disease. The deaths in

London alone varied from a minimum of 522 in 1797 to a maximum of 3,582 during the great epidemic of 1763. A house of charity, called the Middlesex County Hospital for Smallpox, was opened in July, 1746, in Windmill Street, Tottenham Court Road. It was established for the gratuitous inoculation of the disease, and in-patients were inoculated there until 1821, though the inoculation of out-patients had been replaced by vaccination in 1807. The operation of inoculation soon became fashionable, and was reduced to a method. It was considered to require a month's preparation, and subsequent detention for a fortnight. It thus became a lucrative source of income to those who, like Ranby, Hawkins, and Middleton, performed the operation frequently upon patients in the upper and middle classes of society.

Jenner and Vaccination.

The discovery by Edward Jenner, living at Berkeley, in Gloucestershire, of the protective effects of cowpox marks a distinct epoch in the history of smallpox. Vaccination was first announced as a method of treatment in 1796, though the industry of scholars has traced an allusion to the operation in Sancteya Grantham, an ancient Sanscrit work attributed to Dhanvantari, whilst Bruce and Humboldt say that it was not unknown in Persia and South America. It is certain that the dairy farmers in some parts of England and in Holstein held traditionally that cowpox protected from smallpox. Vaccination met with great and powerful support from the first. It was taken up voluntarily by the better classes in England, and its practice was widely extended amongst the poor by the labours of an enthusiastic band of workers, of whom John Ring and George Pearson were the foremost. The advance of the method was also furthered by the remarkable diminution in the number of cases of smallpox which followed the great epidemics in 1796, 1798, and 1800. This diminution was in part to be explained by the increasing number of persons who were vaccinated, but in part, no doubt, it was due to the enormous number of persons who had been protected by taking the disease itself during these epidemics, for one attack of smallpox usually renders a person immune more effectually than the most perfect vaccination with cowpox. Smallpox reasserted itself in the course of a few years with its original

virulence almost unimpaired by vaccination. It was then ascertained that an attack of cowpox only conferred temporary immunity from smallpox, and that it was necessary to repeat the operation of vaccination if the fullest amount of protection was to be obtained. From its very commencement vaccination has been surrounded by the most bitter controversy. It has been attacked upon scientific grounds; it has been attacked from the lowest popular standpoint; statistics have been employed to demonstrate that it is useless. There remain, however, the stubborn facts that since it has been in general use the deaths from smallpox have sunk until they have almost reached a vanishing point in vaccinated, and especially in re-vaccinated, communities, whilst amongst the unvaccinated the disease still flourishes luxuriantly unless the most careful methods of isolating not only the sick, but also the members of invalid households, are enforced at an outlay which is economically prohibitive. Pock-marked faces, too, are now so rare as to excite our attention when they are seen, whilst formerly they were so frequent as to be the rule. All the more highly civilised races of the world have rendered the practice of vaccination compulsory. In spite of the views of faddists and of all objectors to the preventive treatment of smallpox by vaccination, the plain and common-sense view to take of the subject, according to the present state of our knowledge, is the following:—Every child ought to be vaccinated as soon as it is sufficiently strong to bear the operation, and usually the earlier it is done the better. Great care should be exercised in selecting the source of lymph, and the operation should not be looked upon as a trivial one, for the same dangers attend it as may follow upon any slight surgical operation. The vaccination should be repeated from time to time as its protective influence wears off. Too much, on the other hand, must not be expected from vaccination. It does not necessarily confer absolute immunity, and in a few cases it does not seem to confer immunity at all. In a large proportion of cases it protects the individual for a varying length of time from the worst effects of the disease, so that should he be exposed to its contagion, he either escapes variola, or has it in that mild form known to the medical profession as modified smallpox.

R. HUGHES. Art: Lesser Contemporaries of Reynolds.

It will have been observed that the list of the earliest members of the Royal Academy (p. 287) contains the names of no less than ten foreigners. Of these, Cipriani, a painter of mythological inanities, Zuccarelli the formal landscapist. Bartolozzi and Carlini were Italians; Angelica Kauffmann was a Tyrolese; Zoffany and Meyer were Germans; Serres was a Frenchman. Moser the enamelist, and his daughter Mary the flower painter, were Swiss, and Benjamin West came from the English colonies in America, which subsequently gave to England the more solid talent of John Singleton Copley. Nevertheless a good many English artists, not counting those who, like Romney, were intentionally excluded, were left out by inadvertence. The most celebrated of these was Joseph Wright, of Derby. Like Reynolds, whose junior he was by eleven years, he was the son of a small professional man in the provinces, and was sent by his father to Reynolds' master, Hudson. He started as a portrait painter, but his special, if limited, gift lay in quite another direction. It was in rendering the tone and incidence of artificial light that he made his name, and for which he is deservedly remembered. "Give me your firelight," said Richard Wilson to him, "and I will give you my daylight"; but the exchange, if not unfair from the point of view of art, would have been commercially disastrous to Wright, for while Wilson starved, Wright was never in want of paying patronage. He, too, visited Italy, and is said to have made a special study of Michael Angelo; but it is obvious that he found his account not so much in copying the old masters as in making studies of an eruption of Vesuvius, which came in the nick of time during his visit. Though only an occasional exhibitor at the Academy, he was elected an Associate in 1781, and a full Academician three years later; but owing to a quarrel, the details of which are obscure, his appointment was quashed. He was a defective colourist, but the tone of his candlelight is excellent, and he seems to have possessed considerable power as a draughtsman. He is finely represented in the National Gallery by "An Experiment with an Air Pump."

Wright of Derby.

A few only of the less distinguished artists of the time of

Reynolds can here be mentioned. One of these, Nathaniel Dance, himself an original member of the Academy, was a solid and somewhat stiff portrait painter, and the author of numerous historical works of no great interest. John Wootton and George Stubbs, the latter of whom was a scientific student of the horse, and published a book on equine anatomy, were fashionable animal painters. They were succeeded by James Ward, born in 1769, whose "Bull" has rightly found a place in the National Gallery.

Benjamin West and James Barry represented the so-called historical art of the period, the former chiefly on the biblical and religious, the latter on the classical and mythological side. West's pictures, though they now strike us as both vapid and exaggerated, had a great vogue in their day, and he succeeded Sir Joshua in the presidency of the Academy. He is credited with having brought about one beneficial change in English practice, viz. the abandonment of classic costume in the treatment of heroic subjects of modern date. Barry, who was an Irishman and had studied in Rome for five years, was a singular instance of a rather weak and limited talent determined to exercise itself on the scale and in the manner which demands unlimited strength. He finally settled in London in 1771, and was elected two years later to the Academy, where he became professor of painting. He was anxious to be allowed to decorate the interior of St. Paul's, and when his proposals came to nothing, eagerly accepted the proposal of the Society of Arts to decorate their great room in the Adelphi. In a certain way this work, finished in 1784, shows a feeling after grandeur which was unknown to his contemporaries. There is a good deal of vigorous expression, and a management of light and shade that is not far from masterly. But the composition is frequently confused, there is a want of movement in the figures; and, as decoration, it is not very decorative. Like Wilson, he was reduced to great penury, but unlike him, he could not bear his misfortunes with equanimity, and his attacks on Sir Joshua in his public lectures led to his expulsion from the Academy.

Benjamin West and James Barry.

Another Irishman, John Singleton Copley, remains to be noticed. He was born in 1737 at Boston, Massachusetts, a few weeks after his parents reached New England. There

he learnt his trade, and it was not till 1775 that he settled in London. In the following year he was elected an Associate, and three years later an Academician. The elder Pitt died on the 11th of May, 1778, and the tragic incident of his fainting fit in the House of Lords formed the subject of a picture by Copley. A crowded House of Lords, with its long series of bewigged occupants, presented enormous difficulties, and the comparative success of the artist is the measure of the enormous difficulties encountered. More complete success attended his representation of the death of Major Pierson, the gallant defender of Jersey against the French. The vigorous but dignified realism of this work enable it to hold its own against any work of its age, not in England alone, but in all Europe. Even at the present day it would be difficult to name any English historical picture to which it could fairly be asked to yield precedence, and this notwithstanding that the painter, though a sound, was not a great colourist, nor does he display any special brilliancy of touch. As regards its intrinsic truth, as opposed to its dramatic power, it is of interest to recall the fact that the great expert authority, the Duke of Wellington, pronounced it the best representation of actual fighting known to him. The modern passion for truth of local colour and minute accuracy of detail comes out in Copley's picture, the background in the death of Major Pierson having been drawn from the actual scene of the catastrophe. To a like impulse we may attribute his journey to Gibraltar, when commissioned to paint the defeat of the Spanish attack by Lord Heathfield. Some of his portrait groups are admirable, but his high place in English art belongs to him in virtue of his success in that branch of painting where English success has been most rare.

Copley.

We come now to the numerous group of artists who represent the generation after Reynolds, mostly born in or about the third quarter of the century. These men, who, for convenience, may be described as the successors of Reynolds, were frequently his imitators and followers, and occasionally his actual pupils. Such a one was James Northcote, the son of a watchmaker, and originally apprenticed to a watchmaker at Plymouth. Probably on the score of their common West-country origin, Reynolds admitted him to his

studio, first as pupil and then as assistant, and he, more than anyone, should have imbibed the master's spirit. He was one of the most prolific and various of the artists who were employed to draw for the Boydell Shakespeare. He painted in nearly every style; he was a clever writer, and has left us a valuable life of Sir Joshua Reynolds; and Hazlitt's record of his talk shows that as a conversationalist he was incisive and picturesque. But the mantle of Reynolds fell far more on John Hoppner than on Northcote. He was the child of one of the German attendants of the Court at Windsor, and born in 1759. He entered the Academy as a student in his seventeenth year, obtained the gold medal, and became an exceedingly popular portrait painter. His imitation of the President sometimes led him astray, even to the use of his unstable pigments. Some of his pictures which have stood the test of time are exceedingly refined in colour, and at his best he deserved the favourable verdict of his contemporaries.

Reynolds's Successors: Northcote and Hoppner.

A far more individual talent was that of John Opie, the son of a carpenter, born at a village near Truro, in Cornwall, in 1761. His portrait sketches attracted the attention of Dr. Wolcot, the satirist and art-critic, better known as Peter Pindar. He was little more than a boy when he came to London, and in 1782 he exhibited in the Academy. Reynolds compared him to Caravaggio and even Velasquez, and the comparison, though flattering to Opie, indicates where we are to look for the strength and weakness of the painter. A certain savagery in expression and violence in the light and shade are common to both. But his portrait heads are frequently of singular force, and whatever may be urged against his "coarse and unsatisfactory execution," the vigour and facility of the self-taught "Cornish wonder" fix his position as one of the greatest of the *minora sidera*.

Opie.

Another original artist, though his originality was somewhat thin and superficial, was William Beechey. He properly belongs to this generation, though he arrived somewhat later at celebrity. He was a Berkshire lad, intended for a lawyer, and came to London in 1771 to learn his business, being then eighteen. In the following year

Beechey.

he threw up the law, and somehow managed to become an Academy student. When he had finished with the school he started as a portrait-painter in London. His attempts to obtain patronage for the time failed, and he went to Norwich, but, returning to London about 1780, he was fortunate in attracting the royal favour. The favour was obtained by a curious stroke of luck, which is only worth narrating because it shows how prodigious was the value of royal patronage at that period. The portrait of a nobleman painted by Beechey was rejected by the Hanging Committee of the Academy, which so incensed the sitter that he complained to the king, who allowed him to send the picture to the palace. George III., being pleased with the artist, thereupon commanded portraits of himself and various members of his family from Beechey, whose fortune was thus made in a day. He was, perhaps, little influenced either for good or otherwise by Sir Joshua or his greater contemporaries; but his manner was showy, his colour was pleasing. He was knighted in 1798, and died in 1839 at the age of eighty-six. He had, at least, this much of insight into the character of his own gift, that during his long and prosperous career he never attempted an "historical" piece.

Raeburn.

But perhaps the greatest of this generation was the Scotchman, Henry Raeburn. He was born in 1756 near Edinburgh, and apprenticed to a goldsmith of that city; but he early quitted this employment, and, with some little teaching obtained from a Scotch artist named Martin, he started as a miniaturist and portrait-painter in his native city. A fortunate marriage enabled him to come to London, where he was cordially received by Reynolds, who admitted him for two months to his studio and gave him letters of introduction to Rome, where he studied for two years. On his return he set up in Edinburgh, where his commanding talents obtained him a position similar to that of Sir Joshua in London. It is with him that Raeburn mainly comes into competition, but he had a power, or susceptibility of assimilation, not unlike that which is found in Vandyck; and at times he caught the spirit, now of Sir Joshua, now again of Romney or Gainsborough, and —more often, alas!—of Sir Thomas Lawrence. Though a most unequal painter, at his best he can hold his own,

both for strength and elegance, with any of them. At bottom he was a realist, though of a refined sort, and the gift of idealisation, "the painting of the very spirit," was not in him. The technical quality of some of his work, the famous portrait of Mr. Wardrop of Torban Hill for example, is superb, and the masterly execution is backed up by the finest observation. One may note, for instance, in this portrait with what subtlety he has rendered the light faintly piercing the thin nostril to the lip below, while the suffused glow, the melting colour, and broad certain brush work, recalls Northcote's famous saying about a still greater master of the brush—that it seems to have been painted by a wish. How sober and full of life it is, too, and how simply "all that should accompany old age" is set forth in this nobly realistic picture. This is a work of rich brown shadows, but Raeburn could do almost equally fine work under quite different conditions. Take, for instance, the blonde example of the "Greenwich Pensioner," that inimitable portrait of the old English sailor.

None of these men, however, were really destined to take Reynolds's place, either in society or in the world of art. That was reserved for a younger man, afterwards known as Sir Thomas Lawrence. He was hardly out of the nursery when Raeburn was profiting by Sir Joshua's kindness. But Lawrence was the most prodigious of infant prodigies. Even as a baby, he was, in the intervals of riding on walking-sticks and similar childish amusements, engaged in taking likenesses. His parents were both children of country parsons, though at the date of his birth they kept the White Lion Inn at Bristol. The father was a rolling stone, and, after failing at Bristol, he went to Devizes, and thence successively to Oxford, Weymouth, and Bath. These continual changes made education difficult, but his fond parents insisted that their son's talents required no cultivation. At Bath, however, he had some instruction from William Hoare, R.A., a crayon painter of repute, and in that city he made crayon copies at second hand of various works of the old masters. One of these, a crayon of the Transfiguration, obtained the silver palette of the Society of Arts, and the society, with a prophetic insight into the young artist's career, had the palette "gilded all over." Before he was twelve he was a fashionable portrait-painter, and his studio

Lawrence.

"the resort of the fashion and beauty of Bath." In 1787 the family moved to London, and Lawrence was admitted to the Royal Academy. He was extremely beautiful, with his chestnut curls hanging over his shoulders, while there is official testimony to the fact that his proficiency in drawing was extraordinary.

It was while he was still well under twenty that his famous interview with Reynolds took place. Now the burden of Reynolds's sermons to the student in season or out of season, was "Study the Old Masters"; but to Lawrence he adopted a different tone. "Study Nature diligently rather than the Old Masters," was his advice to him, showing as an excellent critic has pointed out, that "he had at once detected the danger that lay in the path of the young aspirant." In two years he leapt into unbounded popularity. His good looks, his flattering pencil, his brilliant talk, his caressing manner, made him the darling of the fashionable world. At the close of his twenty-first year, the Academy elected him a supplemental Associate, the rules not permitting regular membership to anybody under the age of twenty-four. In February of the following year (1792), Sir Joshua died, and the King immediately appointed Lawrence to his vacant post of Royal Painter in Ordinary. Then the Dilettanti chose him as their painter, and no sooner did he reach the age of twenty-four than the honour of the full R.A. was bestowed upon him. He was at the top of the tree at an age when most men are bracing themselves for the climb.

There must have been the making of a much greater painter in Lawrence than fate allowed him to be, for though he was most laborious, and had an unlucky passion for surface finish, a few heads remain, seemingly painted at a single sitting, that are full of fire. It is curious, too, to note how differently he was judged by contemporaries. Thus Fuseli, the painter of nightmares, who was a good draughtsman, declared that Lawrence drew as well or better than Vandyck, and that his women were "in a finer taste." Opie, however, was, we fear, nearer the truth when he delivered the epigrammatic judgment that Lawrence made coxcombs of his sitters, and his sitters made a coxcomb of him. Wilkie, too, has pointed out that the features in nearly all his heads were painted in the same position. His gift of flattering was

sedulously cultivated, and he took amazing liberties in altering and refining the features of his sitters. He has been called "an attenuated Sir Joshua," but the phrase does not seem particularly happy. Except occasionally in his earlier works, he makes no attempt to get to the heart of the matter. In character, where Sir Joshua is specially strong, Lawrence is specially weak. Richness and harmony he cares little for, nor for the mass of light and shade; with him "drawing" is more esteemed than painting, and purity more esteemed than tone. His skill in depicting grace in dress, his delicate draughtsmanship, the beautiful hands, the brilliant eyes, all these must be accorded to Lawrence. But his deficiencies are no less obvious.

Nevertheless, as the last portrait painter in a great succession, as a most prolific artist in a great epoch if not an epoch of great men, Lawrence must hold an important place in the history of English art. He reached the zenith of his fame in 1815 when the Regent knighted him. He visited Aix-la-Chapelle during the Congress, and painted a vast array of Emperors and Kings; but his pictures tell the tale of a gift growing ever more and more common, though occasionally the fine character of the sitter's face lights up the mechanical cleverness of the work. It must be said in his favour that his careful and laborious method—for he had quite lost in later life the childish gift of rapidly seizing a likeness—encouraged the practice of more careful drawing of the head, and that his abstention from bad vehicles and fugitive colours, discouraged imitation of the pranks which Sir Joshua used to play with his pigments. But, undoubtedly, in other ways his example was evil. His was a great gift, yet he reckoned it better to sit at home than to spend time in travel and study. He sought to flatter in the plain vulgar way of improving his sitter's features, not searching out, like Sir Joshua, some better quality of soul. We cannot but think that there was some congeniality between the nature of the man and the time with which he is identified—the time of the skin-deep refinement, the bastard elegance, the fine-ladyhood and fine-gentlemanliness of the Regent and his Court.

H. D. TRAILL. Literature.

THE contrast between the fortunes of poetry and of prose during the eighteenth century has been briefly noted in the Introduction to this work. At the beginning of the period on which we are now entering that contrast had attained to its broadest incongruity of aspect and its strongest emphasis of expression.

Poetry and Prose.

Our prose had been undergoing a steady development in its form, and receiving continuous additions to its resources from the days of Addison and Swift to those of Burke and Gibbon, in whose hands it became an instrument of literary achievements, distinct indeed in character but in their respective varieties never before equalled. Poetry, on the other hand, declining as steadily in spiritual force, straying ever further and further from the living fountain of Nature into the desert of a lifeless art, was now at the furthest point of its aberration. The splendid service which Pope had rendered to the formal perfecting of the heroic couplet, and generally to the structural evolution of English poetry, had left indeed imperishable benefits behind them; but by the operation of that stern law of human affairs which exercised the mind of the dying King Arthur, the once valuable example of Pope had become an almost wholly mischievous influence. In the words of a poet who admired his genius, but was the pioneer of the new movement destined to overthrow his sway, he had made poetry a "mechanic art," till "every warbler" knew "his tune by heart." A few pages, nay, a few dozen lines of the most popular poem of the day, will amply suffice to show how high time it was that the old order should give place to the new, and how much had been done by the "one good custom" of Popian "correctness" to corrupt the poetic world.

The Influence of Pope.

Yet even here it is only just to distinguish. It has been too common to condemn the frigidity and artificiality of the school of Pope, and the divorce of his poetry alike from the truth of eternal Nature and from genuine human feeling, as though these were faults peculiar to himself and cultivated as virtues by his imitators. Again, this fashion of speaking has, as was inevitable, made it equally common to talk of the leaders of the

Romantic and Naturalist revival as though they had brought back the genius of our poetry from a false track adopted under Pope's misguidance and had set its feet again on the true path. But this is to show undue severity to the poet and excessive leniency to his age. The poetic spirit did not go astray under anybody's misguidance during the eighteenth century; and that for the best of all reasons—that it never moved at all. It stood waiting for that enlargement of the poetic faculty which the close of the century was to reveal, and for that new birth of song which the world was to witness, the appointed years being run. Pope simply took the *matter* of poetry as he found it, being in this respect abreast of his age, and not ahead of it, and devoted himself with brilliant success to the perfecting of its form. What we now consider prosaic in his matter derives from the prosaic quality of his era. His feeling for nature is neither more nor less cold, his eye for nature neither less nor more true, than the feeling and the eye of Addison, of Young, of Shenstone, or of Thomson. They and he alike surveyed it in the same scene-painter spirit, with the same restriction of their vision to its broader panoramic aspects, the same blindness to its more subtle beauties, the same insensibility to its magic and mystery. Even in Gray there are but casual and fitful gleams of anything higher and deeper; and the "Elegy" itself, with all its satisfying exquisiteness, contains perhaps but a single stanza—that beginning with "The breezy call of incense-breathing morn"—in which any voice reaches us from the heart of things.

The Demand of the New School.

If the matter of poetry, then, improved not in Pope's hands, neither did it deteriorate, and the demand of the New School for a closer approach to Nature was a protest not against any aberrations of Pope himself, but against the stationariness and the limitations of Pope's period. All that can justly be alleged against him—though that, to be sure, bears heavily enough upon his influence as distinct from his genius—is this: that the amazing brilliancy of his artistic method so effectually concealed the poverty of his matter as to save it for many years after his death from the discredit into which at last it was inevitably doomed to fall. Many a poetaster had to show his futile mastery of the art which Pope had made "mechanic"

before the machinery was detected; a whole generation of "warblers" had to repeat his tune before its empty jingle could be recognised for what it was.

Hayley.

Nor in the year with which this period opens were there any signs that such a discovery was at hand. Of all the warblers to whom Cowper so contemptuously referred, and among whom he doubtless never intended to include his friend and subsequent biographer. none warbled with a thinner and feebler note than William Hayley (1745–1820). Yet Hayley's masterpiece, "The Triumphs of Temper," published in 1781, was the "hit" of the day. Its author was a man of considerable culture and intellectual refinement, and, as his "Epistle to Romney" shows, of no contemptible artistic taste. It is impossible to read his warblings, with whatever amount of critical disdain for the warbler, without conceiving a genuine liking for the man. His nature had all the simplicity in which his art was so lamentably to seek, and his disposition was as modest as his Muse was pretentious. His geniality and good nature break out irresistibly even in his metrical attack upon Hume, and even in his letters to the egregious Miss Anna Seward he cannot heartily abuse even his rough critic Johnson, but is continually slipping in admiring epithets which his fair but fiercer correspondent amusingly entreats him to recall. But Johnson, omnivorous reader though he was, declared himself unable to get beyond the first two pages of "The Triumphs of Temper," and posterity perhaps has never got so far. Its readability even to a seasoned critic is strictly limited to its interest as a deliberate imitation, sometimes declining into a downright parody, of its illustrious model. The frivolous argument of the poem, its mock-heroic manner, its machinery of boudoir *féerie*, and the incidents of the "drawing-room supernatural" through which the fable is evolved, are all most comically reminiscent of the "Rape of the Lock." Every device of Pope's is there, only his inspiration is wanting—only the aërial fantasy and gossamer grace of his inventions, and the intoxicating effervescence of his verse. Every now and then you catch a faint far-off flavour of that lightest and brightest of poetic champagne, but always therewith you get also the disconcerting impression that you are drinking it in the morning out of a bottle that was opened—and left open—the

night before. Taken as a whole, the poem is the most perfect of all imaginable illustrations of the inadequacy of the Popian tradition. Hayley is always faultlessly smooth in his versification, and careful in his workmanship, never slovenly, never inelegant. The errors of his poetic creed stand therefore conclusively proved in the hopeless reprobation of one, who, if poets could be saved by "correctness" alone, would occupy a high position among the blest.

The Della Cruscans.

And what Hayley was, that or worse than that was William Whitehead, the Poet Laureate, and his namesake Paul. Worse still, because wanting in Hayley's honesty and sincerity, and merely pretending to a culture which he actually possessed, were the members of that mutual admiration society of literary fribbles, known as the Della Cruscan School (from the *nom de plume* assumed by one Robert Merry, a leading light among them), who had combined to publish an album of absurdities in which inanity of sentiment and affectation of style contended energetically but with varying fortunes for predominance. Hayley, and Hayley's friend, Miss Seward, coquetted with the school; and a few writers, who one would have thought had "too much wit to be there," like O'Keefe and Reynolds, were more or less formally attached to it. Mrs. Thrale, now Mrs. Piozzi, had relations with it; and among its other members were a ludicrous person of the name of Upton, in whose verses the habitual flattery of self and fellows became almost harmless by becoming wildly ridiculous; one Williams, a man of somewhat greater ability, but worse character and disposition than his colleagues; and a train of other simpletons and impostors whose very names are now as completely lost as those of the poetasters and pamphleteers of half a century earlier would have been if Pope had never written the "Dunciad."

The "Baviad" and "Mæviad."

In the first five or six years onward from 1785, when their precious album first appeared, this school of folly and pretence stood much in need of a Dunciad of its own; and this was at last launched at them from the hand of a rougher and less accomplished but still a sufficient Pope. William Gifford (1757–1826) was a man of humble origin, who by dint of great natural abilities, untiring industry, and the judicious aid of a benevolent patron, had educated himself into a competent scholar and acquired a

position of some eminence in the literary world. His critical taste was none of the most delicate, but he knew nonsense when he saw it, and possessing a considerable fund of rough but genuine humour, together with the mastery of a satiric verse which stands to that of Pope in the relation of the oaken cudgel to the rapier, he turned the faculty and the weapon to such effective account in the "Baviad" and the "Mæviad," his two famous lampoons on the Della Cruscan school, as to reduce that incorporated society of idiots to its constituent atoms of individual imbecility.

Cowper.

The protest of William Cowper against the poetic errors of the time was of a more general and more serious, if of a less direct and conscious, character. Cowper was a scholar, a hymnodist, a writer of moral and satirical verse, before he presented himself to the world in that character of a true and genuinely if not very deeply inspired poet of nature in which alone his name survives. In the year 1784 he had not published—indeed he had not yet been moved to write—anything in the latter character at all. Whether he would have reached posterity as an important or commanding figure in English letters by the projective force of such poems as the "Progress of Error," "Hope," "Charity," and other homilies on the cardinal virtues, or even as "Table Talk," the most vigorous of them all, it is now impossible to say. They were poems essentially of a bygone *genre*—poems reminiscent of a poetic past, and it was inevitable that they should be eclipsed for us by that portion of his poetry which belonged to, or at any rate foreshadowed, the poetic future. Yet they may be read with profit, indeed they should not be omitted, by anyone who desires to take the full measure of Cowper's powers. The last mentioned poem in particular, with its many passages of stirring and occasionally even lofty rhetoric, of admirably just and searching criticism, and its conspicuous mastery of the difficult art of reasoning in rhyme, is a performance of extraordinary merit; but its purely technical qualities are no less remarkable; and, though marred here and there by occasional crudities of phrase and laxities of metre, its rhymed couplet exhibits a masculine vigour of versification which is hardly to be found elsewhere in English literature, if we except a few brief flights of Churchill, since the death of Dryden.

But in 1785 his friend and admirer, Lady Austen, was happily moved to make a suggestion, which he adopted with memorable results. "Write on anything," she replied to him, so the story goes, one day when he was at a loss for a subject. "Write on that sofa." Cowper half jestingly accepted the half jesting commission, and the "Task," a poem in six books, represents his execution of it. It would be too much to say of this delightful and in many respects great poem that it was animated by any deliberate intention to "testify" against the school of Pope. Cowper does, indeed, abandon in it the heroic couplet, but more for freedom of movement than with any polemical purpose. There was, in truth, as little as possible of the innovator about him, and nothing at all of the revolutionist. He shows his essential conservatism by his contented adherence to much of the old-fashioned convention of poetry—its tiresome habit of personifying abstract qualities, its stiff and periwigged ceremoniousness in the handling of common things. Save for a few occasional—and not always fortunate—lapses into familiarity, Cowper's manner of dealing with the domestic is still the manner of the earlier century, still radically opposed to these principles of "natural" poetic diction, on which Wordsworth was afterwards to insist with so much more zeal than discretion, and to delay for many years the acceptance of invaluable truth by exaggerating them in his preaching and rendering them ridiculous in his practice. Cowper is still far from that frank fraternal recognition of the common objects, ideas, and interests of life which is advocated in the famous preface to the "Lyrical Ballads." Poetry in his hands will unbend to common things, but it is always with a too vigilant dignity: she will take notice of the tea-urn and the silk-reels, and the modest indoor pleasures and employments of the country house, but it is all done with the conscious condescension of the squire's wife at the village school treat. And Cowper, moreover, clings still to that leisurely diffuseness of utterance which is so alien to the spirit of the greater poetry, pregnant with thought, and eager to bring it to the birth. One reads him sometimes divided between delight in his perfect literary finish and irritation at its prolixity. Here, for, instance is the concentrated essence of a well known passage in the Sixth Book: "It is cruel to tread

The "Task."

wantonly upon a worm" (four lines); "You may accidentally crush a snail, but any humane man seeing the reptile would spare him" (four lines); "Unsightly and probably noxious vermin, if they invade the house, may be lawfully killed" (six lines), "but as long as they keep to their proper province out of doors it is wrong to destroy them" (seven lines). "In short, man may take their lives if his convenience, health, or safety require it" (three lines), "but not otherwise" (four lines). All these lines to be sure are in the matter of expression irreproachable: but in number they are twenty-eight.

Cowper and Nature.

When Cowper passes out of the garden into the open country, and comes face to face with Nature, when he ceases to moralise and begins to describe, we hear him much more gladly. There is no magic, indeed, in his descriptions, but they have the unmistakable accent of truth. To read him at his best and simplest in this kind, after Pope at his most pictorial, is like passing from a group of Watteau's shepherds and shepherdesses in a perfumed picture gallery to the fresh and breezy atmosphere of the field and fold. We feel ourselves to be at last in the hand of a poet who writes, in the modern phrase, "with his eye upon the object"; whose account of it is at first-hand, and not of hearsay—founded on his own observation, and not on the report of tradition; whose coldest and least illuminating adjective comes from his own brain, and not from the Gradus; who describes things as he sees them, and who feels what he sees. Undoubtedly he does not feel them with the spiritual solemnity of a Wordsworth or with the emotional intensity of a Keats; he strikes a note which wakens no mysterious echoes, but it is at least one which, for almost the first time for more than a century, rings clear and true.

Blake.

Another forerunner of the revival, though one who was wholly without influence in it, having not, indeed, been "discovered" as a poet at all until far on in the succeeding century, was William Blake (1756–1827). As a follower of nature, and a rebel against the artificial, Blake, by some years preceding Cowper, went far to anticipate Wordsworth. His "Poetical Sketches," though not published till 1783, a year after Cowper's first volume made its appear-

ance, were written, it appears, between 1768 and 1776, the earlier in the author's twelfth and the latter in his twentieth year. These were followed by the "Songs of Innocence" in 1789, and the "Songs of Experience" in 1794. Blake, who was an artist before he was a poet, and perhaps one should add, a half deranged mystic before he was either, does not seem, as it was not likely he would, to have caught the ear of a generation attuned to the song of Hayley and Anna Seward. And indeed it must be owned that a singer of so faulty an ear, and a writer of so shaky a grammar as Blake, was hardly well equipped for a pioneer of literary reform. Even now a considerable amount of the little that Blake has left must be rejected by the impartial critic as neither poetry nor sense; but the high poetical quality, the exquisite charm and freshness of the residue, is not to be denied. The affinity of his highest work with that of Wordsworth's best is as striking as the resemblance of the two poets at their respective flattest is amusing. He anticipated the creator of Betty Foy, not in his noble simplicities alone, but in his irritating puerilities also. If he led the way for Wordsworth up the steep of Parnassus, he as certainly preceded him down the slope on the other side into the valley of Bathos. Blake's lack of humour seems to have been as complete as Wordsworth's, and in the elder poet there are lines of sudden descent into prose which startle us almost like a prophetic parody of the younger.

Burns.

To assign to Robert Burns (1759–96) the position of importance which no doubt properly belongs to him among the great lyrists of the world is, in a work of this kind, of course impossible. Rare as was the poetic gift of Burns, and unique in their quality of pure elemental passion as were his bursts of song, the poet himself has no place in what is mainly a history of influences and tendencies. Writing as he did—so long at least as he wrote poetry and not somewhat inferior verse—in the Lowland Scottish vernacular, he naturally could not contribute anything directly to the development of English poetic literature. Nor does it even appear that he directly influenced those who were the main contributors to this work. The first edition of his poems, published at Kilmarnock, appeared in 1786, and the second at Edinburgh in the following year. Its success with his own countrymen was instant, his

fame during the last ten years of his short life unbounded; and it has been growing ever since on both sides of the border. But while Burns, who, though he died two years before the publication of the "Lyrical Ballads," was in ardent sympathy with the beginnings of the new poetic movement in England as initiated by Cowper, whose "Task" he described as a "glorious poem," it can hardly be said that he attained to any general popularity among English readers until the Naturalist and Romantic school had fully established itself. Burns, in other words, did not help to lead English taste in poetry back to nature; it was nature that led it to Burns.

Wordsworth and Coleridge.

Wordsworth was but thirteen years old when Cowper's "Task" was published, and Coleridge only twelve. That they must have read and admired that poem in youth and early manhood may be taken as certain, but that they were much or at all influenced by him there is no evidence to show. Whatever direct external influence is traceable in their earliest productions came from Germany, but the development of the two poets proceeded, it should be remembered, though it is too often forgotten, at a very unequal rate. Coleridge, before completing his twenty-fifth year, had produced two of the finest and most mature of his lyrics, the "Ode to the Departing Year," and the other and even nobler piece entitled "France." Wordsworth, on the other hand, though two years Coleridge's senior, had published only those early pieces which, though no doubt they contain the germ and potentiality of his later and greater poetry, yet can hardly be said to have given assured promise of his future fame. It was not till just upon the close of our present period that the two young poets joined in the publication of that collection of poems, whose appearance is conveniently, though in some respects not quite accurately, taken as an epoch-making event in the history of the Naturalist movement. The first volume of the "Lyrical Ballads" was issued in 1798, and the second, with Wordsworth's famous preface, in 1800. Our consideration of them, therefore, may be appropriately deferred to the next chapter.

Crabbe.

But poetical, like political, revolutions are never the work of one or two men. The revolt against the degenerate tradition of the school of Pope had been fermenting in many minds and took more than one

specific form. With Wordsworth it was mainly a craving for a more honest report of external nature and a simpler form of poetic speech. But the poetasters of the Popian succession had not wandered further from truth to nature than from fidelity to the facts of human life. A demand for *realism* in the portraiture of humanity, and of the world in its relations to mankind, was as inevitable a product of the revolt against the dominant poetry as was the demand for veracity and simplicity in the poet's account of nature; and the former now found voice of almost brutal energy in the verse of George Crabbe (1754–1832). Crabbe, the son of a parish schoolmaster, who afterwards obtained a petty local office in the Customs, came up to London in 1789 with his poem of the "Library" in his pocket, but little else, and after coming within measurable distance of starvation, from which he only escaped through the providential interposition of Burke, was enabled by that kindly and judicious patron not only to publish his already written work, but two years later, in 1783, to bring out a second poem, the "Village," on which even more perhaps than on the "Parish Register," the "Borough," and the "Tales of the Hall," the fame of the poet rests. It is not a highly poetic fame; there are, indeed, "doctors of weight" in criticism who deny to Crabbe the name of a poet at all. But if he lacks that charm which is necessary to convert truth into poetry, his work has in it the root of the matter—truth itself. We do at least get away in it from the conventional world of Pope, and from the idealised rural life of Goldsmith. The "Village" set before us by "Nature's sternest painter but her best," as Crabbe has been called, is vastly unlike "Sweet Auburn"; but we feel, after near a century of the clogged and loaded poetry of the bygone era, that this bitter draught of realism is refreshing. And we get it nowhere else till Wordsworth's rather turbid beverage has fined down. What remains of poetry till then, is only the irreproachable didactic numbers of the virtuous Mrs. Hannah More, and the dramatic commonplace of that other heroine of Scott's too easily captured admiration, Joanna Baillie.

English Prose.

English prose in this, even more than in the immediately preceding, period is dominated by the two great names of Burke and Gibbon. This, indeed, might even have been the case had their literary

merit been far less eminent; for, in fact, they were now almost the last survivors of that band of distinguished prose-writers who had adorned the literature of the previous generation. Johnson died in the year with which this period commences; Hume and Goldsmith had passed away several years before; Richardson and Fielding had preceded Hume to the grave—the one by fifteen, the other by more than twenty years. Gibbon and Burke had, therefore, no prose contemporaries of the first rank, nor indeed, with the exception of Mackintosh, any of the second.

Gibbon.

The four years from 1784 to 1788 witnessed the production of the last volumes of the "Decline and Fall," and permanently established its author in that position of supremacy as a historian of which each succeeding generation renders his tenure more secure. It was, perhaps, not unnatural that his favourite and sometimes rather fatiguing trick of hinting at, instead of openly displaying, the vast stores of his learning should have at first aroused suspicions of its reality, or at least its depth; but that "allusive manner," by which the smatterer of our own days so skilfully conceals the superficiality of his knowledge, was with Gibbon simply a point of style. Gibbon's "we could an if we would" is sincere, whereas the smatterer's real position is that he would an if he could, but that as a matter of fact he couldn't. When the latter quotes half a dozen words from some recondite authority, it is because he does not know enough of the matter to fill a sentence; when the former does so, it is only because he is resolved not to break the flow of his narrative by expanding into half a dozen sentences of digression what he can compress into a few words. And invariably in his case, as never in the other, the few words are found on fuller knowledge to be perfectly exact as far as they go. "Every careful critic of his own and other men's work knows," it has been well said by Mr. Saintsbury, "that there is no more dangerous point than this one of slight reference or allusion to subjects imperfectly known, nor any one in which sciolism or imposture is most certain to be found out. Yet it is scarcely too much to say that Gibbon has never been thus found out. There were some things—not many—which he did not and could not know; but almost everything that there was for him to know he knew." And

he used his magnificent wealth of knowledge with a judgment in matters of detail and with a breadth and sweep of generalising power which has seldom been equalled and never surpassed.

His Style.

On the merits and demerits of his style it cannot be pretended that the same consensus of competent opinion prevails. It has been reprehended by many who had some right to criticise it, and by more who had not. Coleridge, whose own prose style, with all its eloquence, left much to be desired, condemned it in terms so extravagant as to discredit the critic rather than the criticised; but others, reviewing it with less bias, and expressing themselves with more moderation, have managed to draw up a pretty long list of objections to it. It has been pronounced monotonous, inelastic, affected, pompous; it has been called exotic in its spirit, and un-English in its structure. The most serious of these charges is, perhaps, the second. The last is not, indeed, without a certain superficial plausibility, though, no doubt, it would scarcely have occurred to anyone who was not acquainted with Gibbon's admiration for the French as a medium of expression, or was ignorant of the fact that he actually began the composition of his great work in that language. When, however, the attention is called to it, the fact is found to be indisputable that the typical Gibbonian sentence has strong affinities of construction and cadence with that of the *prosateurs* of France. Especially is this noticeable in Gibbon's apparent determination never, if he can help it, to close his sentence with a verb, adjective, or participle, and his uniform habit, in itself the cause of a certain monotony, of bringing it to an end, as often as may be, on a substantive governed by the preposition "of." Such sentence-endings would, no doubt, be found upon inquiry to preponderate largely in all English writers over any other single form or description of syntactic clauses; but in Gibbon the preponderance is so excessive as to make analysis almost amusing. Out of thirty-five consecutive sentences upon two pages selected from the "Decline and Fall" by the arbitrament of the inserted paper-knife, no fewer than twenty have this form of termination. That is to say, it is of more frequent occurrence not only than any one other, but than all other forms taken together.

It will be found, we think, that what is felt as the somewhat too monotonous uniformity of Gibbon's cadences is due, in great measure, to a latent consciousness on the reader's part of this inordinate uniformity of construction. In any case, however, the complaint is not a very serious one against a prose writer of Gibbon's majestic power. The sea is distinctly monotonous; that is one of "the defects of its qualities." But there are those who can listen to the sound of its waves for considerable spaces of time without being bored, and similar enthusiasts are to be found who do not easily tire of listening to the rolling surges of Gibbon's prose. Those who do can find plenty of distraction in later English writers. By the shores of the sounding sea are many gay kiosks and casinos, where they will find a band discoursing selections from the masterpieces of lighter comic opera.

The charge of pomposity partly depends for its gravity on that of affectation, or in other words of pretence, and partly on the charge of inelasticity. Loftiness of manner, when displayed in social life by those whose position warrants it, usually receives the more complimentary appellation of "stateliness." It is not described as pompous till it is felt as ridiculous. And in Gibbon its approaches to the ridiculous are comparatively rare, and when they occur are necessarily due to an inelasticity of style which cannot accommodate itself to the minor requirements of a historical narrative. Gibbon (and this incidentally refutes the reproach of affectation) simply could not be familiar. His stateliness was not only natural to him, it was inseparable from him. He showed that in his "Autobiography," to which indeed it lends much of the charm with which those inimitable confessions are instinct. When Gibbon "sighs as a lover, but obeys as a son," the reader admires as a critic, though he smiles as a man. His condescensions to the insignificant or ignoble, wherever he meets them in his history, have much the same sub-comic effect as his handling of these domestic matters in his autobiography. But these, after all, are but infrequent experiences with any serious historian. For all other purposes—for those of straightforward narrative equally with those of comment and disquisition—his style is, to say the least of it, a satisfactory instrument: while as a vehicle of wit, irony, eloquence, and richly yet soberly coloured

description, its measured manner makes it brilliantly effective.

Burke.

It was said, records Croker, by Sir James Mackintosh, that Gibbon might have been cut out of a corner of Burke's mind without Burke noticing it. To determine Mackintosh's own proportional relation to Burke by the same scale would compel a resort to the calculus of infinitesimals. The saying was, in fact, an impertinence in every sense of the word, and as inept to boot as any other attempt at the admeasurement of incommensurables. But we can understand how a comparison between the two men's minds should have produced such an impression of their spatial disparity on a mind considerably less commodious than either. It is undoubtedly true that after an hour's walk with Burke through any abstract subject which he found particularly stimulating, we do seem to have covered a considerably greater amount of intellectual ground than if we had accompanied Gibbon for an equal period of time through any even of the most philosophical parts of his history. But that is to some extent a deceptive effect of the greater number and more rapid succession of ideas, or sometimes merely of images, with which Burke will have filled our minds during the walk. In other words, it is not, as Mackintosh erroneously supposed, in the wider reach and expanse of his intellect that Burke had the advantage of Gibbon; it is in the greater natural energy and the habitually much more active play of an extraordinary imagination expressing itself through a vocabulary the richest and most various that ever served the tongue or pen of man.

This, however, having been said by way of protest against an exaggerated and invidious comparison, let it be admitted that Burke, even if we cannot exactly cut Gibbons out of him, impresses with a combination of thought and expression at a higher power than Gibbon attains. Political writers both sagacious and eloquent have flourished at all periods of modern English history. The thought and the expression were often united in the same person, and in some instances with a profundity in the one gift matched worthily with distinction in the other. But it may well be doubted whether any writer on politics and the philosophy of politics has ever combined sagacity and eloquence in such measure, or anything

approaching to such measure, as that in which they are combined by Burke. Of course he was not absolutely proof against the influences of tradition and training, and he allowed some Whig dogmas to pass with insufficient interrogation; but with these exceptions, and they were comparatively few, his brilliant generalising faculty and splendid theorematic powers were everywhere guided and held in check by a resolutely practical criticism of common sense. It was during our present period that this unparalleled array of gifts was to receive its most memorable illustration. In 1790 appeared the "Reflections on the French Revolution," in which all the argumentative and all the rhetorical abilities which Burke had displayed in his earlier works were enlisted in a cause to which he was most passionately devoted. And the result was a masterpiece.

Sir James Mackintosh.

To pass from Burke to Mackintosh is to make the descent from genius to talent with more suddenness, not to say violence, than one would naturally prefer. Yet Mackintosh is perhaps the only other prose writer who can be even mentioned in the period overshadowed by Gibbon and Burke; for Robertson, though an historian of merit, can hardly be said as a prose writer to be anything more than an echo of his English models. Mackintosh has undoubtedly more individuality. The "Vindiciæ Gallicæ" can still be read with pleasure; and did it not everywhere challenge a disastrous comparison with the monumental work to which it is the very inadequate answer, it would win more admiration than it does. As it is, one cannot help reading it with a feeling that with all its more than respectable merit it is thoroughly characteristic of that universal genius whom partial friends regarded as an Admirable Crichton and posterity has clean forgotten.

R. E. PROTHERO. Agriculture.

In the first three quarters of the eighteenth century a striking advance had been made in farming; the cultivation and rotation of crops were better understood, and stock-breeding had become a science. But this progress was partial and strictly local. Only in the Eastern counties and Leicestershire had the tillers of the soil profited by the new sources of wealth which men like

Tull, Townshend, or Bakewell had revealed. The character of the farmers, the size of the holdings, and the comparatively small number of open fields, partly explain the superior enterprise of agriculturists in these favoured districts. Writers, like Arthur Young and Marshall, agree that, in Norfolk, farmers occupied "the same position in society as the clergy and smaller squires"; in Lincolnshire, "many had mounted their nags and examined other parts of the country"; in Leicestershire, they had "travelled much and mixed constantly with one another." Elsewhere, however, agriculture had made little or no advance for centuries, owing to the prevalence of wastes, the system of open-field farming, the absence of leases, the poverty and ignorance of hand-to-mouth farmers, the obstinacy of traditionary practices, the want of markets, and the difficulties of communication. Till these obstacles were overcome, agricultural progress could not be general. It is with the removal of these hindrances to advance that the name of Arthur Young is inseparably connected.

Obstacles to Progress.

Vast districts, as has been already said (p. 100), still lay waste and unenclosed. So late as 1795 a report of the Board of Agriculture stated that twenty-two million acres lay waste in Great Britain, of which more than six-and-a-quarter millions were in England. Besides these tracts of uncultivated land, it has been calculated that in more than half the parishes of England the soil was in 1760 farmed in common by village communities on the system previously described. Thus in Cambridgeshire out of 147,000 arable acres, 132,200 were in open fields; out of 438,000 acres in Berkshire 220,000 were similarly cultivated. The Vale of Pickering, in Yorkshire, was farmed by the township, the common sheep-walks and pastures were overrun with weeds and bushes, the arable fields exhausted by an unvarying succession of crops, the meadows mown year after year without intermission or amelioration. At Naseby a few pasture enclosures surrounded the mud-built village; the open fields, tilled on the three-fold system, were crossed and re-crossed by paths to the different holdings, filled with a cavernous depth of mire; the pastures were in a state of nature, rough, full of furze, rushes and fern. Similar to these instances was the condition of almost every open-field farm.

Waste Land and Joint Tillage.

No rotation of crops in which roots formed an element could be introduced on land that was held in common from August to Candlemas; among the underfed, undersized, and underbred flocks and herds of the commoners it was impossible to practise the principles of Bakewell. It was not without reason that Arthur Young came to the conclusion that "the Goths and Vandals of open-field farmers must die out before any complete change takes place."

Land Tenure.

Without some security for his outlay no tenant could be expected to invest capital in his farm. But the tenure by which land was most commonly held, except where it was freehold or copyhold, was an agreement voidable on either side at six months notice. In Essex and Suffolk leases for terms of years, with clauses as to management, were not unknown. But elsewhere leases were regarded with suspicion not only by tenants, but by landlords, because they "told the farmer when he might begin systematically to exhaust the land." Where a good understanding existed between landlords and tenants, a simple tenure at will, or from year to year, practically secured the farmer in his holding; yet its nominal uncertainty undoubtedly checked all enterprise on the part of tenants. Leases for lives were also common; but, though they gave fixity of tenure to the farmer, their utility was marred by the absence of any clauses as to management or any provision for the maintenance of farm buildings. Without long leases, no tenants would invest their capital in the land; without careful provision for management and repairs, no landowner could safely surrender to an occupier the entire control of his holding for a lengthy period.

The Bonds of Tradition.

Other formidable obstacles to progress lay in the ignorance and poverty of farmers, the mass of local prejudices, and the obstinate adherence to antiquated methods. Open-field farmers lived from hand-to-mouth, and the antiquated system on which their land was tilled was only adapted to supply the producers themselves with their daily food. Their ambitions did not rise beyond sustenance to profit. Where farms were enclosed and tilled by individual tenants, or copyholders, or yeomen, traditional practices were treasured as agricultural heirlooms. Thus, for instance, in Kent, in the time of

Hartlib, and, a century and a half later in the time of Young, it was not unusual to see twelve horses and oxen to one plough. In Hampshire, Lisle, writing in the eighteenth century, says that it was the practice to employ from eight to ten oxen to each plough. A trace of the practice survives in the ancient crooked ridges which may be seen on grass-lands. The enormous length of the team and the unwieldy plough required a vast width of head-row on which to turn. To obviate this difficulty a deflection or curvature was made in the furrow, and the result is the curved ridge which may still be seen. In Gloucestershire, at the close of the eighteenth century, two men and a boy and six horses were employed for ploughing. A Norfolk ploughman, with a pair of horses and a Norfolk plough, was sent into the county who did the work in the same time at a saving of £120 a year. But it was twenty years before any of the neighbours profited by the example. Young, writing in 1768, says that clover and turnips were unheard of in many parts of the country. Clover was not sown in Northumberland till 1752. In the same county turnips were sown broadcast till 1780. Horse-hoeing, till nearly the close of the century, was rarely practised outside the Eastern counties. In 1811 Davies wrote an agricultural report on Wiltshire; but, though sheep were the sheet-anchor of the county, turnips were still almost unknown.

The Difficulties of Locomotion.

The difficulties of dissipating local prejudices and disseminating new ideas were enormously increased by defective means of communication (p. 346). Turnpike roads had been established in 1663, and, at least as early as the reign of George II.

> "No cit nor clown
> Can gratis see the country or the town."

Yet, in the eighteen miles of turnpike-road between Preston and Wigan, Arthur Young measured "ruts four feet in depth and floating in mud only from a wet summer," and passed three broken-down carts. In Essex "a mouse could barely pass a carriage in its narrow lanes," which were filled with bottomless ruts, and often choked by a string of waggons buried so deep in the mire that they could only be extracted by thirty or forty horses. "Of all the cursed roads that ever disgraced this kingdom in the very age of barbarism, none

ever equalled that from Billericay to Tilbury," cries Young in 1769. In country districts, in fact, roads were mere lanes, generally engineered on the principle that "one good turn deserved another." During the winter many were almost impassable except by well-mounted horsemen. The bells on waggon horses were not in those days merely an ornament; but were a necessary warning when two teams could not pass each other.

The Effect of the Industrial Revolution.

Shut off from their neighbours by impassable roads, and impelled to raise no more from the soil than their own needs demanded, farmers had little stimulus to improvement. But Watt, Arkwright, and others changed the face of society with the swiftness of a revolution. Population advanced by leaps and bounds in crowded manufacturing centres. Huge markets sprang up for agricultural produce. Hitherto there had been few divisions of employment, because only the simplest implements of production were employed; cloth-workers and weavers combined much of their work with the tillage of the soil. But the rapid development of manufacture caused its complete separation from agriculture, and the application of machinery to manual industries completed the revolution in social arrangements. A division of labour was an economic necessity; farmers and artisans became mutually dependent. How was the change to be met? How was a country, with a strictly protective policy and at war with Europe, to raise food for a rapidly growing population concentrated in the coal and iron fields? It was evident that farms must be made efficient manufactories of beef and mutton for the million; that large farms, capitalist tenants, long leases, must sweep away every obstacle to good farming; and that, compelled to make a choice, England must sacrifice to the artisan her wastes and commons, her farming communities, her small yeomen and copyholders, and exchange the picturesque varieties of the peasantry for the monotony of wage-dependent labour.

The Work of Arthur Young.

In this agricultural revolution Arthur Young played a conspicuous part, though it may be doubted whether his spirited crusade against bad farming would have produced any result if it had not been supported by industrial necessities. To him,

more than to any other individual, were owing the enclosure of wastes, the extinction of the open-field farms, the partition of commons, and the consolidation of holdings, which changed the face of rural England with the rapidity of an earthquake. To his energy, again, were mainly due the dissemination of new ideas on agriculture, the collection of agricultural statistics, the diffusion of the latest results of experiments, the creation of the Board of Agriculture, the establishment of farmers' clubs, ploughing matches, and agricultural shows.

Born in 1741 at Bradfield Hall, near Bury St. Edmunds, Arthur Young began his career by failing as a practical farmer. In 1767 he commenced those farming tours in the course of which he drew his graphic sketches of rural England, Ireland, and France. From this date till 1810 his efforts on behalf of good farming were unremitting. His brain was never weary; pamphlets and reports flowed from his pen, and his "Annals" were a farming periodical to which George III. often contributed. In 1793 the Board of Agriculture was created, and he acted as its secretary till his retirement in 1810. He died in 1820, having been for ten years totally blind. For half a century after his death the completeness of his success obscured his fame. He recognised the absolute necessity of providing food for a growing population, and offered a common-sense solution of the difficulty. His general aim may be summed up in the policy of developing to the full the resources of the country, the reclamation of wastes, the partition of commons, the break-up of open-field farms, the consolidation of holdings, the investment of capital in the land by both landlord and tenant, long leases, large tenancies, and the most improved methods of cultivation and stock-breeding. More produce, as he put the case, meant more profit—higher rents to landlords, larger incomes to farmers, better wages to labourers, and more food to the nation. The system which he advocated, aided as he was by the pressure of war-prices and the gigantic increase of the manufacturing population, was established with such completeness that men forgot the previous existence of any other conditions. It is only of recent years that his name has been revived in England by the renewal of the struggle between large and small farmers, while in France, where the contest between capitalist farmers and peasant

proprietors has never been decisively terminated, the discussion has always centred round his name.

Reclamation and Enclosure.

The two most important changes in rural England which belonged to the closing years of the eighteenth century were the reclamation of wastes and the partition of commons. Enclosures aimed at bringing into cultivation all the improvable land of the country, and they resulted also in destroying the open-field system which was dependent on commons. The old method of enclosing commons and wastes was by writs of partition and admeasurement. But the proceedings were too costly to be used on any large scale. In more modern times commons were divided by consent of the interested parties or by private Acts of Parliament. Here, again, the difficulties were so great as practically to prevent enclosures. It was almost impossible to obtain the consent of all the parties interested, and four-fifths of the commoners, the lord of the manor, and the tithe-owner, were obliged to agree before a Parliamentary sanction could be obtained. Under the pressure of social changes, many private Acts were obtained as the century drew to its close. But the process of enclosure was greatly accelerated after 1801, when the first general Act was passed. Between 1793 and 1809, it has been calculated that $4\frac{1}{2}$ million acres of land were added to the cultivated area of England and Wales. There can be no question that, viewed in an agricultural and economical aspect, enclosures were profitable to the country. But socially the advantages of the change are less conclusively proved. It is probable that "A Country Gentleman," who, in 1772, wrote a pamphlet on "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Enclosing Waste Land," expressed the truth when he said that landlords, farmers, and the nation gained by the change, but that the common field farmer must suffer by becoming "a hired labourer."

The Social and Economic Effects.

The result of enclosures, which were the great social feature that marks the closing years of the eighteenth century is, in fact, the extinction of the common field farmer, and his transformation into a wage-earner. The disappearance of the yeoman and the small freeholder was the result of different causes, and, in the main, belongs to a later date. Against individual losses must be placed the national gain. Without

the enclosure of her wastes and commons, and the break-up of open-field farms, England would never have fed her growing population, supported the strain of the Napoleonic wars, and gained the first place in the race for industrial supremacy.

"Where," asks Young, with perfect truth, "is the little farmer to be found who will cover his whole farm with marl at the rate of 100 or 150 tons per acre? Who will drain all his land at the expense of £2 or £3 an acre? Who will pay a heavy price for the manure of towns, and convey it thirty miles by land carriage? Who will float his meadows at the expense of £5 an acre? Who, to improve the breed of his sheep, will give 1,000 guineas for the use of a single ram for a single season? Who will send across the Kingdom to distant provinces for new implements, and for men to use them? Who will employ and pay men for residing in provinces where practices are found which they want to introduce into their farms?"

The new system of farming was, in fact, a necessity of the times. Landlords and tenants put their capital into the land, and found it the most profitable investment. Farming began to make a rapid and general advance. Mr. Coke of Holkham is, perhaps, the most conspicuous instance of a great landlord devoting himself, by the expenditure of capital and personal energy, to the development of his estate. His long and useful career extended far into the present century, and will be more appropriately noticed at a later stage. But the movement which, from 1772 onwards, he headed in the Eastern counties found its representatives among large landowners in every part of England and Scotland. With the close of the eighteenth century commences the system of farming with which we are to-day acquainted, and the threefold division of the landed interest into landlords, tenants, and labourers.

G. TOWNSEND WARNER. Manufacture: The Steam Engine.

ALTHOUGH it is wrong to imagine that before the days of Watt the steam engine was not a practical working machine, yet it was only useful in a strictly limited way. It was useful for pumping, and that was practically all. One reason of its limited application, namely, its cost, has been explained in a previous section (p. 317). But there was another reason, which was that the capability of combining the longitudinal movement of the piston rod with the rotatory movement of the wheel was not clearly grasped,

although the crank had long been in use for lathes. It is true that in 1736 Jonathan Hulls had placed a pair of paddle wheels in the stern of a boat, and had employed a Newcomen engine to work them. But his gear was very clumsy, and the boat when tried on the Avon was a failure. In all the pumping engines the power was applied to a beam, and a pump rod attached to the other end. This suited the immense length and the slow pace of the Newcomen engine. But the time was now come for something better, and the man who made the manifold improvements necessary was James Watt.

In 1756 Watt, then a mathematical instrument maker, was endeavouring to set up in Glasgow. Obstacles were put in his way by the town guilds, as he had not served his apprenticeship there, but the University gave Watt the use of some rooms in one of their buildings where the town guilds had no power of molesting him. A model of the Newcomen engine came into his hands for repairs in 1763, and he began to experiment with it. He soon perceived that the source of failure of the Newcomen engine lay in its waste of heat, due to condensing the steam in the cylinder itself. No less than three-quarters of the heat was wasted. This waste would be solved by keeping the cylinder always as hot as the steam that entered it; palliatives, such as steam jackets, non-conducting cylinders, and so on would not go to the root of the matter. He hit on the plan of having a separate condenser in which a vacuum might be created, so that the steam would rush into it, and be there condensed, and made a model on these lines, which worked well. The problem was theoretically solved, but it was long years before the practical difficulties were overcome. One of these was to provide a good vacuum in the condenser. For this Watt used an air pump worked by the engine. He also covered in the top of his cylinder to prevent loss of heat when the piston descended, and made the piston-rod pass through a stuffing-box. This would have prevented the atmospheric pressure acting on the piston at all, but Watt had determined to dispense with atmospheric pressure, and so he admitted steam above the cylinder, and made it do the work of driving down the piston. When this was

done a way was opened between the upper and lower part of the cylinder; the pressure of steam thus equalised above and below, the weight of the pump gear drew the piston up again, and the steam left below being condensed in the separate condenser, the engine was ready for another stroke. Thus, instead of the old atmospheric engine, there was created the steam engine. Watt only used low pressures at first, for so long as the condenser and vacuum were used a low pressure would do the work. But even now Watt had two great foes to struggle with—expense and bad workmanship. The first of these was overcome by a partnership with Roebuck, of Carron, entered into in 1767, by which Roebuck contracted to pay debts incurred to the extent of £1,000, and find money for further experiments. In return he was to take two-thirds of the profit. Watt took out a patent, and went on experimenting. But even the Carron workmen did not work nearly true enough for him. His cylinders drove him to despair; he tried copper, block tin, lead, cast iron; the hard ones were not made true, and the soft ones soon worked out of shape. The engine built by Watt at Kinneil could not be persuaded to go properly. And, to make matters worse, Roebuck got into financial difficulties, and in 1773 went bankrupt. He owed £1,200 to Matthew Boulton, of Birmingham, and in payment of this Boulton took the two-thirds share in Watt's engine. The Kinneil engine, "Beelzebub," as Watt called it, was taken to pieces, packed up, and sent off to Birmingham.

Boulton and Watt.

Matthew Boulton, Watt's new partner, had begun as a manufacturer of small metal articles, buttons, links, shoe-buckles and the like. He had money to start with and had prospered. In 1762 he had built works at Soho and enlarged his business, adding to it the manufacture of plate and articles in ormolu. In 1769 he had been offered a share in Watt's patents, but had not taken it up. He was energetic, enterprising and hard-headed, and was particularly honoured for his determination to try to remove the reproach from "Brummagem" goods by sending out everything of the best quality. With his help Watt soon began to make progress. Wilkinson, of Bersham, cast an eighteen-inch cylinder and bored it true. The Soho workmen worked with accuracy. In 1776 Watt's engine, built for

Wilkinson at Broxley, was a success. Orders came in fast. "Pray tell Mr. Wilkinson," writes Boulton, "to get a dozen cylinders cast and bored from twelve to fifty inches diameter, and as many condensers of suitable sizes. The latter must be sent here, as we will keep them ready fitted up, and then an engine can be turned out of hand in two or three weeks. I have fixed my mind upon making twelve to fifteen reciprocating and fifty rotative engines per annum." In 1777 Watt himself went to Cornwall to set up pumping engines there, of one of which, built at Chacewater, he writes: "The velocity, violence, magnitude and horrible noise of the engine give universal satisfaction to all beholders." It "forked" water as no engine had done before. The news spread rapidly over the country. In 1781 Boulton wrote to Watt, "The people in London, Manchester are all *steam-mill* mad." In 1783 Watt built a steam-hammer capable of striking 300 blows a minute, with a stroke of two feet and a hammer head of seven and a half hundred-weight; but his and other steam-hammers of the eighteenth century, were all "tilt" hammers—that is, the hammer was fastened at the end of the shaft and the head raised by the action of cams or some such plan; thus the head moved on a curve and would only strike a full straight blow on a comparatively small object, for a big object did not leave the hammer room to do any effective work. In this way the machine was unsatisfactory, for the heavier and bigger the job, the less the hammer could do. Watt in no way forestalled Nasmyth, whose hammer is on a different and better principle. In 1786 Watt made double-acting engines of considerable size, which were set up at the Albion Mills, near Blackfriars Bridge. The engines were of fifty horse-power each and worked with a steam-pressure of five pounds to the inch. They drove twenty pairs of mill-stones, and could grind 150 bushels of wheat an hour, and the steam-power was also used for fanning, sifting, loading and unloading, hoisting and so forth. The gear for these celebrated mills was designed by John Rennie (afterwards the engineer of Waterloo and London Bridges) and was a novelty, being made entirely of cast or wrought iron. Hitherto wood had been used almost universally, though Smeaton had made an iron wheel at Carron in 1754, and Murdock had fitted rough iron

Watt's Steam Hammer.

gearing to a mill in Ayrshire. Watt himself had suggested the use of iron—this is proved by a letter from Boulton in 1781, saying, "I like your plan of making all the principal wearing parts of tempered steel and the racks of best Swedish iron, with the teeth cut out. Query: Would it not be worth while to make a machine for dividing and cutting the teeth in good form out of sectors? The iron would be less strained by that method of cutting." But in excellence, ingenuity and accuracy of workmanship, Rennie's gear was remarkable, and it was the beginning of a complete change in millwork. To return to Watt's engines. Saw-mills in America, sugar-mills in the West Indies, paper-mills, flour-mills, engines for flint grinding in the Potteries, were ordered in quick succession. In 1785 one was ordered for a silk-mill in Macclesfield, and one was built for Robinson's cotton mill at Papplewick, in Nottinghamshire. The first engines in Manchester and Glasgow were set to work in 1789 and 1792 respectively. In fact between 1780 and 1800 the steam engine was established as the motive power of the day. When wind-mills lay idle and water-mills were frozen up Watt's engines worked on and worked economically.

The inventor himself was never tired of improving his own work. His suggestion of iron gear has already been mentioned. He was the first to use steam expansively, cutting off steam at half-stroke. He invented the "governor" to regulate the throttle-valve and so keep the power developed steady. As the crank, an old mechanical device, was patented for use with the steam-engine by Pickard, and so wrested from him, he designed a new plan for securing rotary motion—the sun and planet wheel. He made his engines double-acting, admitting steam in turn above and below his piston. Improvements came fast from Soho. His assistant, Murdock, made the first oscillating engine, though he did not bring it into practical use, and he was also the first to apply coal gas as an illuminant. From 1794 till 1802 Murdock carried on trials. At the celebration of the Peace of Amiens, in 1802, Soho was lit up by gas, and in 1803 the works were regularly lighted by it. Other firms soon followed the example of Soho, and in 1805 Watt found gas in pretty general use in Glasgow. Mr. Smiles notes as an illustration of how slowly knowledge spreads and how permanent is illusion, that the gas in the pipes

was long believed to be on fire, and that when the House of Commons was first lit by gas, members were to be seen cautiously feeling the pipes and wondering that they were cool.

Coal and Iron.

By 1783, as far as smelting was concerned, coke and pit coal had practically driven their rival charcoal from the field; but for one purpose charcoal still held its own, and that was for making malleable iron. This fact held back the iron trade just as the scarcity of yarn had held back the textile industries. The first person to make a success of using coal for malleable iron was Henry Cort. Like most other inventors he was not really the first in the field, but rather one who brought to perfection what his predecessors had left in an unfinished state. The advantage to be gained was so obvious that every ironmaster must have turned his thoughts to it. It is stated that Roebuck, at Carron, worked out his bar iron with pit coal in 1763, but the bar iron here mentioned can hardly have been malleable, for Watt writes that he went to Carron and showed them how to make tough iron, and that before that they had never turned out a ton of it. In 1766, however, two brothers named Cranage, employed at Coalbrookdale, told Reynolds that they thought pit coal might be used in a reverberatory furnace, that is a furnace where the flame alone reaches the iron, instead of the iron and fuel being in contact as they are in a blast furnace. Now the idea of a reverberatory furnace was not a new one, as one of the pioneers in the use of coal, a German named Blewstone, had tried smelting in a reverberatory furnace in the latter years of the seventeenth century. But the brothers insisted on the probability of success in the attempt to turn cast into malleable by this method, and as the event proved they were right. The problem was to get the iron in a purer state, in which it is tough instead of being brittle as cast iron is, and to do this it was necessary to get rid of impurities such as silicon, sulphur, and phosphorus, and at the same time to reduce the amount of carbon. Reynolds allowed the Cranages to try their idea at Bridgnorth, and the experiment was successful. He says, "the iron put into the furnace was Old Bushes, which are always made of hard iron, and the iron thrown out is the toughest I ever saw. A bar, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches square, appears to have very little cold short in it." "Cold

short" is the technical term for brittleness in iron when cold, caused by the presence of phosphorus. No blast was employed and the fuel was pit coal. Although the first experiment was promising yet there must have been something wrong somewhere. Reynolds was not a man to neglect a new idea, and the fact that Coalbrookdale did not make a reputation by the Cranages' process is a sufficient proof that complete success was not attained. In fact, the quality of the iron turned out varied so greatly that no reliance could be placed on it. Another attempt was made by Peter Onions of Merthyr Tydvil in 1783. His furnace was charged with pig iron, the doors luted up and a blast used. The fire was to be kept up until the metal became less fluid, when it was to be stirred by a workman, gathered into a lump and then forged. This process turned out good malleable iron, but just at the same time Cort was able to offer a better.

Cort: Puddling and Rolling.

Henry Cort, who was born in Lancashire in 1740, had set up as an iron master at Fontley, near Fareham. As Russian iron was mostly used for the purpose of making malleable iron in England, and as Russia had just raised the prices from 70 to 220 copecks the ton, Cort was led to try if something could be done with English pig. As the result of his experiment he took out, in 1783, a patent for the use of grooved rolls for rolling out iron into bars or plates instead of putting it as before under the hammer; and in 1784 he patented his process of puddling. The reverberatory furnace was used with a hollow bottom to contain the metal when fused. Pig iron was put in and the heat provided by pit coal. The furnace was kept closed till the metal was fused. An aperture was then opened and the fused metal stirred by a workman with long bars of iron, when an ebullition took place and a bluish flame was given off. During this the iron was decarbonised: that is, the excess of carbon was burnt off and the iron was left in a purer state. The flame was so managed that the iron was brought at the last to a pasty consistency, so that it could be collected in lumps or "blooms," these being raked about in the furnace till of a sufficient size to be taken out. They were then put under the hammer or into the squeezer, after which they went into Cort's rollers. The saving effected by Cort's process of puddling combined

with rolling may be judged by the fact that before his time an out-turn of twenty tons a week of malleable iron was as much as any works could manage. The hammer had to be kept hard at work to work out a ton of average sized bars or plates in twelve hours, while with the rollers fifteen tons could be worked in the same time. Cort sent plates of his manufacture to the navy contractors, who approved of them and gave him orders for the navy. He set up works at Gosport. The great ironmasters of South Wales, Homfray and Crawshay, heard of his invention, came to inspect it, and agreed to pay Cort royalties for the use of it. The process became still more widely adopted in consequence of Cort's bankruptcy and the seizure of his patents by the Government. Substantially the same process is still in use. No change has been made in principle, although, with increased knowledge, some modifications have been made in detail. One defect in Cort's furnace was that, the bottom being made of sand, it was necessary for a fresh "hearth" to be made for each puddling, and as but a small quantity of iron could be puddled at a time, the output was kept small. In fact a puddler could only work four hearths a day. The process had been much accelerated by substituting for the sand a hard bottom of cast iron plates, on which a layer of cinder is melted so as to form the bottom of the furnace chamber on which the iron is worked. The stimulus given to the iron trade by Cort's invention was wonderful. Malleable iron became cheaper and more widely used. To take one example only: Crawshay, at Cyfarthfa, in 1787, was making forty tons a month, while in 1812 the same works were turning out 200 tons each week.

Migration of Iron Trade.

As coal or coke could now be with advantage substituted for charcoal in all the main processes of iron manufacture, the necessity of carrying on iron works in the neighbourhood of forests came to an end. The full effects of this will call for remark later on when it is possible to regard the migration of industry which accompanied the industrial revolution as a whole. The iron industry set itself down where there was coal: that was now the first requisite. Water communication was also of importance; and at first water power. Roebuck placed his works as far as possible near water power. South Wales, too

was convenient in this respect. So little known were the mineral riches of this part of the kingdom that in 1765 Bacon was able to get a 99 years' lease of the mineral rights extending over forty square miles of country round Merthyr Tydvil for £200 a year. In less than twenty years Bacon was able to retire on the profits coming from his furnaces and the sale of his rights. Cyfarthfa, Pen-y-darran, and Dowlais, all owe their beginnings to this sale. The small operations of Crawshay, at Cyfarthfa, have been already mentioned. But Crawshay had been connected with the iron trade in an even humbler way. He was a Yorkshire lad, and had been sent up to London, apprenticed to an ironmonger, who, finding that among his customers the sharpest at driving a bargain were women who came to buy, or if occasion offered, to steal flat-irons, set young Crawshay to manage the flat-iron business. His natural sharpness raised him step by step, till the ironmonger's apprentice became the "Iron King" of South Wales, whose progress through his countryside was the signal for all the people to turn out and wonder at his unofficial majesty. The era of great ironworks had begun. The Carron Company (p. 313) had five blast furnaces, sixteen air furnaces, a clay mill, an engine raising twenty-eight tons of water a minute to work the blast, and four boring mills. In 1784 Coalbrookdale had sixteen fire engines (as steam engines were then called), eight blast furnaces, nine forges, and more than twenty miles of iron railway. This last was due to Reynolds. Wilkinson's operations have been already mentioned. Iron-masters all over the country gave Boulton and Watt orders for steam engines to work the blast, and as the power of the blast grew, the size of the furnaces built increased very much. The furnaces used by the charcoal masters had been from twelve to eighteen feet high, but they were now built much larger. One built at Butterley, in 1790, was forty feet high, made square and entirely of stone. One of seventy feet was built in Wales, but this was found to be too big, and it was reduced in working height to forty feet by knocking a hole in the side. The generality were from ten to twelve feet wide at the boshes (the widest part), diminishing to four feet or so at the top. This was afterwards found to be too narrow for the best results. One tuyère was generally used. With the

Great Ironworks.

steam-blast ironmasters had no longer to think of anything but coal, iron ore, a flux, and, where possible, water communication. The ironworks in the charcoal districts came rapidly to an end. In the Forest of Dean coal could be obtained easily enough, but the days of the Sussex furnaces were numbered. By 1788 there were only two still in blast, at Farnhurst and Ashburnham, and these stopped work soon after; while in their stead, furnaces flared in parts of Wales, Scotland, and the North of England, where hitherto there had been nothing but a little coal mining. The well-known Bowling Inn Works started in 1780, and were followed, before the end of the century, by those of Low Moor and Farnley. "Best Yorkshire" iron, the produce of these companies, was made by substantially the same process as is in use to-day. The coal used was the "Better Bed" coal, and this, when coked, yields the purest coke in the world, sulphur being present in very minute quantities. The ironstone found above the "Black Bed" coal was brought to the surface, weathered to detach the adhering shale, calcined, smelted, and run into pig. The pig was then refined by melting under cinder, with a blast directed on to the surface. This leaves almost all the carbon contained in the pig, but much reduces silicon, sulphur, manganese, and phosphorus. In the final process of puddling the carbon is reduced and the iron left exceedingly pure. The refinery was also in use in South Wales at about the same date, and was generally supposed to have been the invention of Samuel Homfray. In 1791 there were in England seventy-three blast furnaces using coal and making annually 67,548 tons, and twelve in Scotland making 12,480 tons. There were only twenty-two charcoal furnaces still in blast. Still there were 20,000 tons of Oregründ iron imported from Sweden, and 50,000 bars and slabs from Russia. By 1796 the total number of blast furnaces had risen to 121 with an average annual make of 1,000 tons.

Textile Industries.

From 1740 to 1783, thanks to the inventions of Hargreaves, Crompton, and Arkwright, the supply of yarn became plentiful, more in fact than the weavers could deal with. In this chapter we shall see a corresponding advance made in weaving, owing to the application of power, either water, or, later, steam to the loom. With the exception of Kay's invention of the flying

shuttle, the hand-loom had remained substantially the same machine for centuries. Kay's invention (p. 307), while enabling the weaver to weave wider cloths, and to weave faster, had not revolutionised weaving in the way that the invention of the jenny, the mule, and spinning by rollers had done in spinning. The revolution in weaving was begun by Cartwright, the inventor of the power loom. This person, who was a clergyman, visited Arkwright's mill in 1784, and, the conversation turning on the possibility of making machines to weave, maintained that it could be done. He was ridiculed, but stuck to his idea, saying that there were only three motions required. He went away, thought it over, and with the aid of a blacksmith made the first power loom. It was an extraordinarily clumsy machine, but this is perhaps not astonishing if Cartwright's statement is to be believed, that prior to the completion of his own power loom, he had never even seen an ordinary hand-loom at work. In his power loom the warp was placed perpendicularly, and he adds, "the reed fell with the weight of half a hundredweight, and the springs which threw the shuttle would have thrown a Congreve rocket." In fact it required the strength of two powerful men to work the machine even at a slow rate. However, encouraged by his success, he took out a patent in 1785, and then did what most men would have done first of all, namely, inspected and got to understand the action of the ordinary hand loom. After doing this he was able to make several improvements which he combined in a new patent, and set up a factory at Doncaster. He was not the first to hit on the idea of machine weaving; nor was he actually the first to put it into execution. M. de Gennes had made a power loom of some kind in the seventeenth century, and in 1678 a patent was taken out for "a new engine to make linen-cloth." But Cartwright was the first to attain a measure of practical success, especially in the weaving of wide goods. Cartwright's first machinery was worked by a bull, but his Doncaster factory was furnished with a steam engine in 1789. In 1791 a Manchester firm contracted for 400 of his power looms, but the factory was burnt to the ground, probably by the workmen, who thought they saw machinery taking work out of their hands and bread out of their mouths.

Cartwright's Power Loom.

Cartwright did not rest content with his patent for the power loom, but also patented a machine for woolcombing in 1789, though here, again, he was preceded by Isaac Mills, who took out a patent for the same object in 1723. The effect of this upon the worsted industry was very great. In woollen manufactures, properly so-called, the wool is of short staple, the fibres of which are matted closely together, and so the yarn owes its strength not to the length, but the tenacity of short fibres closely intertwined. Worsted is made of wools with long staple, and these had to be combed or straightened out by hand. The industry was thus dependent on the handcombers, who got plenty of work and good wages, so good that, like the hand-spinners of an earlier day, they could and did indulge in a considerable amount of idleness. Cartwright's invention put a term to their prosperity. By his machine the first operation opened the wool, and made it connect together in a rough sliver, but did not clear it. The clearing was performed by the second or a third operation if necessary. Three of his machines with an overlooker and ten children would comb a pack of wool in twelve hours. As neither fire nor oil was necessary for machine combing, the saving in these alone generally paid the overlooker and children, so that the manufacturer himself pocketed what he used to pay the hand-combers, while for machine spinning the machine-combed wool was said to be 12 per cent. better than the hand-combed, since it was better mixed and the slivers uniform. Cartwright said that it did the work of twenty hand-combers, but according to a verse of the time the machine familiarly known as "Big Ben" could do more than that.

"Come, all ye Master Combers, and hear of our Big Ben,
He'll comb more wool in one day than fifty of your men
With their hand combs and comb-pots and such old-fashioned ways,
There'll be no more occasion for old Bishop Blaize."

St. Blaize, it may be explained, is the patron saint of wool-combers. Cartwright's machine was not entirely satisfactory, and improvements and alterations in combing machinery were made by Toplis, Hawksley, and Wright. The wool-combing machines excited great opposition. A Bill was brought into the House of Commons to forbid the use of the machines altogether, but it was thrown out. In

fact, the days for such interference were passed. Parliament was taking a wider view of what was good for industries, and now declined to cripple a growing trade in order that men who possessed a certain specialised skill should be exempt from the competition of machinery.

Two other improvements remain to be noted, not exactly textile processes, yet closely connected with textile arts. They are bleaching and cylinder printing.

Bleaching.

The old process of bleaching necessitated immersions in numerous leys and the subsequent exposure of the goods to the air for long periods. The Lancashire towns were surrounded by vast bleaching fields. To persons unaccustomed to the sight of these white fabrics in great numbers side by side and length by length, they have all the effect at a distance, especially in sunlight, of extensive and brilliant sheets of water. Linen required six months to bleach. In 1774 Scheele discovered chlorine and the bleaching properties of this gas and some of its compounds were demonstrated by Berthollet in 1789. It was shown that by the new process bleaching could be performed in 48 hours. A good deal of experiment was required before the process was at all perfect, but by 1800 it was used by many, including Tennant, of Glasgow, who made considerable improvements. The saving in time was enormous, although the new bleaching process was injurious to the lasting power of the things to which it was applied, and this defect has not been overcome even in our own day.

Cylinder Printing.

An equally great saving was brought about by the invention of cylinder printing. Printed calicoes had been forbidden by the Act of 1721 (pp. 113, 140), as it was presumed that it was impossible for them to be of native make. In 1736, by the so-called Manchester Act, printing was permitted on fabrics which had a linen warp, as these were of native make. This was the Act which impeded Arkwright until its alteration in 1774, when colour printing on calico again became legal. But the old process of colour printing was excessively slow. The colour was applied by hand to a wooden block and the block to the material. The blocks were very small, mostly about ten inches by five. To print a piece of calico 28 yards in length required the application of the block 448 times. If another colour was required, the whole

operation had to be gone through again. Block printers got 40s. to 60s. the week; pattern drawers wore fashionable clothes and were called "Mr." The usual patterns were leaves variously disposed, small circles, pippins, clubs, dice, diamonds, spots, and flower-heads of the daisy or buttercup. It was from his use of the parsley-leaf as a pattern that Peel (the grandfather of the statesman) got his name "Parsley Peel." Colours were crude and staring—the cheapest print cost 3s. to 3s. 6d. the yard. In 1764 Fryer, Greenhow, and Newbery projected a machine for printing, staining and colouring silks, stuffs, linens, cottons, leather, or paper by copper cylinders, on which the colour was laid by other cylinders. In 1765 there was "a gentleman" (indefinite) of Paris who printed 200 ells of calico per hour, or said that he did. The practical use of cylinder-printing in England began in 1783 with a machine made by a Scotchman, Bell. The great firm of Livesey, Hargreaves, Hall & Co. took it up in 1785. The machine was made with six cylinders, on which the pattern, or part of the pattern, was cut. The colour was supplied to each cylinder by what is called the "box doctor," and was removed from where it was not required by an elastic steel blade. The machine could do as much as a hundred block-printers and a hundred tear-boys working in the old style. Prints rapidly increased in elaboration and fell in price, and a great use was made of the cheap novelty.

Varieties of Goods.

Cotton goods were made in great variety. Thanks to Crompton, the English muslin trade grew rapidly to large proportions. Muslins were made in Lancashire of several kinds; book-muslin, mull-muslin, leno and lighter muslins in Glasgow; they were also striped and checked. Pullicat and Bandana handkerchiefs came from Glasgow, dimities from Warrington and Yorkshire; cotton cambrics, sewing thread, and vast quantities of calico from Arkwright's mills, and from Lancashire. For many purposes cotton superseded silk.

Cotton.

In 1775 the import of cotton was 4,764,589 lbs., in 1785 it was 11,482,083 lbs., in 1789 it was 32,576,023 lbs. Out of the twenty-three million pounds imported in 1787, nearly seven millions came from the West Indies, six millions from French and Spanish colonies, nearly six millions from Turkey, two-and-a-half millions from Brazil,

and about a million and a half from Dutch colonies. The American import was practically nothing. In 1784 an American vessel with a cargo of cotton was seized by the Customhouse officers, who sought to condemn it under the Navigation Act, on the ground that cotton was not produced by the United States. The cotton imported from America in 1871 was more than five thousand times as much as the import of 1791.

The spread of machinery from the cotton industry into its neighbour linen was not long deferred. **Linen.** The principles to be applied were, widely speaking, the same, but technical difficulties springing from the difference in nature between flax and cotton, took some time to overcome. The records of the Scotch Board of Trustees for Manufactures from 1760 onwards contain frequent mention of improved machines, but these were not practically successful. In 1787 Kendrew & Porthouse, of Darlington, took out a patent for a machine to spin hackled flax, by adapting Arkwright's drawing rollers in use in the cotton industry. Two important linen firms took out licences to use this machine—Marshall & Co. of Leeds and Shrewsbury, and James Ivory & Co. of Brigton. The latter firm built a large mill in 1789, and is said to have carried on work successfully till 1803, when the firm failed. One of the partners started the concern again in 1804, but it had a chequered existence, failing again in 1815, and being for sale in 1817 for £2,000 without finding a purchaser. The Kendrew patent may have worked, but it was not a commercial success. Marshall & Co. had the same experience with it, but they had the aid of Matthew Murray, who made several improvements. Still, during the years 1788–1793 the firm found that flax spinning by machinery had not, so far, proved remunerative. Fresh inventions, an improved spinning frame and a carding engine for tow patented by Murray in 1793, were more successful, and from this time flax spinning was a commercial success. In the last years of the century John Marshall, who had been left as sole partner in the firm, was joined by capitalists. New mills were built at Leeds and Shrewsbury, the latter 150 ft. long, 36 ft. wide, and five storeys high. In 1793 the firm had 832 spindles running, and in 1810, 5,796. In the same year the finest count of yarn spun was 30 leas; 25 leas

having been spun for at least six years before that. In 1809 one of the partners took out the first patent for hackling by machinery. It is worth while being somewhat explicit about the early flax spinning, on account of the fact that the invention is sometimes claimed for a Frenchman, de Girard. In 1810 Napoleon offered a million francs for the invention of flax-spinning machinery, and it is said that de Girard with wonderful promptitude, invented his machine the very next day. Prompt as he was, he was some twenty years behind the English firms I have mentioned. In fact, his chief claim to be reckoned the inventor of flax-spinning is that his machinery brought him into bankruptcy—a fate too often shared by his kind.

J. E. SYMES. Finance.

When Pitt first came to power he found a deficit of six millions in the national Budget, and a National Debt of unheard-of proportions. The American war and other causes had raised the country's debt in twenty-eight years from seventy-four millions to two hundred and forty-four millions. Pitt had, however, three great advantages. England was at peace; the industrial revolution, though still in its infancy, had already greatly increased the production of wealth; and Pitt had studied Adam Smith, and had gathered many valuable hints from the "Wealth of Nations." In his first Budget (1784), in spite of the existence of a heavy deficit, he boldly reduced the duty on tea from 119 per cent. to 12½ per cent. on its value. He saw that the excessive duty had led to such extensive smuggling that the revenue was defrauded, and that the reduction would stimulate consumption. Some new taxes must, however, be imposed to choke the deficit and make up for the loss. He decided to impose various licence duties, to tax horses whether kept for riding or driving, and also silver plate (gold was already taxed), and windows. The last of these proposals was probably unwise. It was a discouragement to the due lighting of houses. Pitt's object was to get money out of the classes that could best afford it, and in a manner that could not be evaded without considerable inconvenience. He was also anxious not to add to what we should call "protective" duties, and, no doubt, his choice was

somewhat limited. The Budget of 1785 introduced extensive changes. These were mostly of the nature of readjustments and reforms in the methods of collection. Pitt had learnt from Adam Smith to attach great importance to diminishing the cost of the collection of taxes and to reducing to a minimum the temptation to fraud. The chief of the new taxes fell immediately on shopkeepers. Pitt, however, believed that they would ultimately be paid by the customers, and that it would be convenient in the first instance to levy them on the shopkeepers. These taxes were, however, violently denounced, and were mostly dropped in 1789, probate and legacy duties being substituted for them.

Pitt's Sinking Fund, 1786.

By the year 1786 the national finances were so far restored that Pitt felt himself in a position to begin redeeming the National Debt. He proposed that one million pounds should be set aside from the revenue every year to accumulate at compound interest for this purpose. He was apparently not altogether unaffected by the familiar fallacies conspicuously illustrated in a well-known work by the moralist, Dr. Price (p. 245), growing out of the fact that a small sum set aside annually at compound interest will in time accumulate to a gigantic amount. He tried to make careful provisions against any interruption of the working of his automatic sinking fund. It was to be vested in Commissioners, and withdrawn as far as possible from the control of Parliament. But what was to be done if Parliament authorised new loans for which a higher interest would have to be paid than was being obtained for the sunk millions? Any child could see that in such a case the fund would be worse than useless. Yet Pitt attached so much importance to the almost futile attempt to tie the hands of subsequent governments, and his opinion had so much weight with the country, that, in order to keep the fund intact, the nation went on putting money to accumulate at 3 per cent. and at the same time borrowing at 6 per cent. The fund was kept up till 1807, in spite of the growing debt and the increasing rate of interest.

Commercial Treaty with France.

As was to be expected in a disciple of Adam Smith, Pitt was a convinced Free Trader; but there was, as yet, no chance of getting Parliament to assent to what is still called by many "one-

sided Free Trade." So he had to content himself with negotiating commercial treaties, of which the one concluded with France in 1786 was the most important. Under this treaty most of the protective duties between the two countries were either diminished or swept away. It is interesting to note that the opposition to the treaty came chiefly from manufacturers, the support chiefly from landlords; a curious inversion of what happened in the Free Trade controversy of our own century.

Finance, 1787–1792.

Pitt's Budgets during the next few years introduced no important changes. There happened to be an extraordinary series of bad harvests from 1789 to 1792, and the prosperity of the country depended then far more upon the harvest than it does at present. Nevertheless, industrial progress and the wise finance of Pitt were producing such results that in 1792 a number of bold remissions of taxation were introduced, especially in the interests of the poor and of the lower middle classes. Thus the taxes on women-servants, and on candles, were now abolished, and the tax on windows was limited to houses that had at least seven windows. England was now on the verge of the great war, but our great minister had so little expectation of such a catastrophe that he thought he could afford some loss of revenue.

Crisis of 1793.

The war came, and with it a severe financial crisis. This would, no doubt, have occurred, even if the country had remained at peace. Its fundamental cause was the over-trading encouraged by the recent prosperous years. An immense amount of capital had also been locked up in the new machinery, factories, and canals. The bank note circulation had nearly doubled in the eight years, 1784-1792, and the reserves and credit of many of the banks were very inadequate. Then came a bad harvest, and a sudden increase in the number of bankruptcies, which rose to 105 in the November of 1792, as against a previous monthly average of fifty. There was a slight improvement in December. On February 1st came the declaration of war, and it was almost at once followed by heavy failures. Of the four hundred country banks, one hundred stopped payment, and most of the others were in serious straits. Everyone began to call in his money and to refuse to lend. The locked-up

capital could not be realised, and the Bank of England, in spite of appeals from the Government, insisted on contracting its issues. Many solvent firms were now in grave peril. A Committee of the House of Commons was hastily formed, and at once recommended the issue of Exchequer Bills to the amount of five millions. Under this scheme loans of over two million pounds were made; but the mere knowledge that the Government was prepared to lend to anyone of assured solvency had probably more effect than the actual loans. The panic ceased. Every penny that had been lent was repaid, and Government made a clear profit on the transaction.

The War and Commerce.

When the crisis had once passed, the war exercised at first a far less harmful influence on trade than might have been expected. Our naval supremacy enabled us to take possession of much of the business that France would otherwise have done. In 1795 the Republic dominated Holland, and this enabled us similarly to annex much of the trade that had hitherto been in Dutch hands. The removal of our two great competitors went far to counterbalance both the loss of our trade with France and the increased perils to our merchant vessels. Moreover, we captured many French and Dutch ships with rich cargoes. The value of such prizes taken during the war of 1793–1802 is estimated at above fourteen millions.

The Rivalry of Neutrals.

The commercial advantages we should otherwise have gained were, however, much diminished by the necessity of conciliating neutral powers. By the "Rule of 1756," a neutral had no right to relieve a belligerent by trading that was illegal at the outbreak of the war. This brought on disagreements with states who complained that we were interfering with their trade from ports in the West Indian colonies of France. The rule was, therefore, modified in 1794, and again in 1798. Neutrals were then allowed to carry the produce of enemies' colonies to their own ports or to England. It was found, however, that this gave much scope for evading the objects of the rule. Trade was carried on, especially in American ships, between hostile ports by using American ports as nominal destinations or places of exit. Thus, an American vessel would ship a cargo from a French

colony, carry it to an American port, and thence to some place whence it could be easily introduced into the enemies' country.

The Armed Neutrality.

A still more serious blow to English trade was the threatening attitude of the Baltic Powers (p. 377). Their contention was, in effect, that neutral vessels might conduct the trade of belligerents, except that in contraband of war. Such goods as timber, hemp, etc., were not strictly contraband, but they were useful for warlike purposes, and there were strong political as well as commercial reasons for our objecting to such a claim. There were further disputes as to what constituted an effective blockade. Russia, Sweden, and Denmark entered into a convention to enforce their views and Russia laid an embargo on all British vessels within her ports. England, in retaliation, adopted a similar policy in the case of Russian, Swedish, and Danish vessels (1801). The Battle of Copenhagen followed. But for our present purpose it suffices to notice that the attitude of the Northern Powers was a fresh check to English commerce.

The Distress.

As time went on the burden of the war began to be severe. Our population was growing very fast. The census of 1791 had shown an increase of nine per cent. The census of 1801 showed an increase of eleven per cent. in ten years. This was during a period when the war was raising the price of agricultural products, when the industrial revolution was displacing many labourers by its changes in manufacturing processes, and when taxes were being steadily increased. Pitt remained, on the whole, faithful to the teachings of Adam Smith. He tried to keep down the burdens laid on the poor, and to derive his taxes from property and successions. He even adopted the principle of graduated taxation. His expenses were enormous.* He was obliged to increase the Customs and other duties that fell largely on the poor, and the landlord interest in Parliament was so strong that real property was exempted from some of its legitimate burdens. We cannot wonder that there was much suffering among the working classes, and that the

* The Revenue of Great Britain and Ireland rose from 18·9 millions in 1792 to 33 millions in 1800.

King, as he drove through the streets, was greeted with shouts of "Bread" and "Peace" (1795; p. 491).

In 1796 the fear of a French invasion caused a run on the country banks. These withdrew their reserves from the Bank of England. The specie in the latter sank below a million in February, 1797, and Government had again to interfere. This time they adopted the sweeping policy of making the Bank's notes inconvertible, except in certain specified cases. One of the chief objects of this new departure was to set free gold and silver for exportation. In addition to the expenditure on our own expeditions, we were sending large subsidies to our allies. In 1795 we sent £478,000 to Hanover, £317,000 to Hesse Cassel, £150,000 to Sardinia, and smaller sums to Brunswick, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt. Pitt seems to have under-estimated the tendency of the precious metals to flow back, after such exportation, to a country which was producing more commodities than it consumed. This excess was the real measure of our capability to conduct an expensive war. Still, there can be no doubt that the use of inconvertible paper for currency gave a temporary relief, and the disadvantages were, perhaps, worth incurring, so long as the issue was carefully limited. The bank directors were quite alive to the importance of such limitation. The recent experience of France under the *assignat* system had illustrated the evils of an excessive paper currency, and the Bank of England used its powers with so much prudence and moderation that for eleven years (1797—1808) their notes were not seriously depreciated, as compared with gold, except occasionally and temporarily. It is probable, however, that the use of inconvertible paper helped to cause a general rise of prices, which aggravated the misery of the poor.

Inconvertible Currency.

Meanwhile, the difficulty of meeting the expenses of the war and the subsidies to allies was leading to more and more taxes. In 1796 a second ten per cent. was put on the assessed taxes. Additions were made to the duties on horses, wines, tobaccos, and hats. The succession duties were made more productive, especially by compelling executors to pay them before handing over the property to

Budgets. 1796–1801.

the legatees. In 1797 there were fresh additions and increases, especially in the duties on transfers. Most of the stamp duties were doubled. Every sale by auction was taxed, and a duty of ten per cent. was laid on all legal deeds. Still there was a deficit, and in 1798 Pitt appealed to the country to submit to what was called a triple assessment, under which all persons should pay *at least* three times as much as they had paid in assessed taxes in the previous year. Those who had paid more than £25 were to have their tax more than trebled. Those who had paid £50, or more, were to have the charge quintupled. An alternative was offered of an Income-tax of ten per cent. on all incomes of over £200 per annum. Incomes under £60 were to be exempt. Incomes between £60 and £200 were to have abatements. Pitt's next scheme was to raise capital by allowing landlords to redeem their land-tax, on terms so very favourable that the tax on nearly a quarter of the land of the kingdom was redeemed in 1798 and 1799. Next he appealed to all who could afford it to subscribe voluntarily towards national expenses, and he actually obtained in this way more than £2,000,000. Finally, he definitely substituted an income tax for the complicated triple assessment scheme, which had proved almost unworkable, and had led to much fraudulent concealment (1799). In view of this, he made a calculation of the income of various classes, which may be thus summarised:—

Landlords (as such) (England and Wales) ...	£20,000,000
Tithe Owners and Tenants (from land) ...	£10,000,000
Houses, Mines, and Canals	£8,000,000
Professional Earnings	£2,000,000
Scotch income under above four heads ...	£5,000,000
Income from Over-sea Possessions (Great Britain) ...	£5,000,000
Income from Public Funds	£12,000,000
Profits from Foreign Commerce	£12,000,000
Profits from Domestic Trade	£28,000,000
	£102,000,000

This estimate takes no account of working-class wages, and most likely under-estimated the incomes of other classes. But it is interesting, even though it must be regarded as only a rough approximation. Owing to various deductions, the tax was only expected to bring in seven-and-a-half

millions, and it actually produced only six millions, and so, in 1800 and 1801, fresh taxes on commodities had to be imposed. Pitt had tried to meet each year's expenses out of taxation. He had taken alarm at the growth of the debt and the decline of the national credit; but in spite of all his endeavours he had added two hundred and seventy-one million pounds to the National Debt by the close of the war (1802), by which time it is calculated that the annual charge for the debt was equivalent to 10 per cent. of the total income of the nation, and that taxation absorbed another 20 per cent. of that income.

Economic Doctrine; Adam Smith.

We have already noticed the influences of the "Wealth of Nations" on the financial policy of Pitt, especially in connection with the Commercial Treaty of 1786 and the national Budgets both before and during the war. In other respects Adam Smith's relation to the economic history of this period is rather that of a skilful analyst than of a powerful influence (p. 332). "Division of labour" continued to develop. Production was more and more carried on on a large scale, but the employers of labour were probably not so much influenced by the arguments of the Scotch professor as by the evidence of practical experience. Our industrial evolution had now reached a point when it was inevitable that the factory system should spread, and that manufacturing towns should increase both in number and size. This increase was naturally promoted by new mechanical inventions and applications. It was further facilitated by the war, which, while disorganising industry, made many openings for ingenious, able, or lucky persons to build up fortunes by availing themselves of the exceptional conditions. It was not till a later time that Smith's influence again became very important. Another economist was, however, now beginning to produce a considerable effect upon national thought. This was Malthus, whose first essay on the "Principle of Population" appeared in 1798. Hitherto it had generally been assumed that an increased population was a rational object of hope. Now England's population was increasing at an unprecedented rate (p. 478), but with it the poverty of the working classes was also increasing. Economic theories are generally the outcome of special

Malthus.

economic conditions. In this case the injurious effects of a growing population were largely due to three sets of circumstances, viz.: (1) The disorganisation caused by the industrial revolution, with the special inducements it offered to child labour from the point of view of immediate wages, and the absence of any protective influences of Factory Acts, Education Acts, etc. (2) The high price of bread aggravated by the war, which made the importation of food dangerous and expensive, and cut us off from some of the markets which would otherwise have supplied us with food. (3) A defective poor law (of which more will be said in the next chapter), which directly encouraged the reckless multiplication of the poorest classes. The doctrines of Malthus also fitted in with another tendency which lay almost outside the sphere of economics. The reaction against the French Revolution included a reaction against the high hopes of human perfectibility—of a golden age that would reign on earth when once political tyrannies were overthrown. To cherish such hopes now was to be suspected of French sympathies, of lack of patriotism, and of the desire to promote a reign of terror. Malthus struck the hardest blow that had yet been struck at political utopias; for he maintained that there was "a cause intimately united with the very nature of man," fatal to all such utopias, namely, the tendency of population to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence. We need not discuss the general truth of this proposition. It must suffice to say, that in the year 1798, when the "Essay" appeared in its first form, it was literally the case in England that, while wealth in other forms was probably increasing more rapidly than the population, wealth, in the form of food, was not keeping pace with the number of mouths that had to be filled.

ARTHUR GRIFFITHS. Prison Reform: Howard.

Prison reform, or rather the crying need for it, began with John Howard. Until the advent of the great philanthropist towards the end of the eighteenth century, every form of atrocity and abuse had flourished unchecked in the gaols of the United Kingdom. Howard, however, aroused people who had hitherto remained callous to less eloquent

invective. Earlier, in 1728 that is to say, and at the instance of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, Parliament had made a feeble inquiry into the state of gaols. Again, Mr. Popham had brought forward a Bill to abolish gaolers' fees, which became law in 1774. But now John Howard entered upon his self-imposed labours, and at great peril to himself commenced his visitation of prisons. He travelled all over the country, penetrating the most noisome dungeons, bringing fearlessly to light the widespread horrors he found. From one end of the kingdom to the other our prisons were a standing disgrace to civilisation. Imprisonment, from whatever cause it might be imposed, meant consignment to a living tomb, an existence of acute suffering. Gaols were pest houses; a fell disease peculiar to them, but akin to our modern typhus, was bred within their foul limits, and flourished constantly, often in epidemic form. The gaol fever slew more than the hangman, and its ravages extended to the courts, to judges, juries, barristers, witnesses, and all who approached the poisonously affected assize. What wonder, when hundreds of hapless folk were huddled together in narrow underground dens, practically deprived of light, air, water, and an adequate supply of food?

State of the Gaols.

Gaols were mostly private institutions, or at least worked so as to pay their way, leased out to ruthless, rapacious keepers who used every menace and extortion to wring money out of the wretched beings committed to their cruel care. Gaol fees were imposed upon all, even the untried; men declared innocent by the law were hauled back to prison until they could satisfy these monstrous charges. The use of fetters was universal, although even then deemed illegal; all alike, tried and untried, male and female, young and old, were laden with chains so that the gaoler might secure another perquisite, the bribe he demanded for easement of irons. Prisons were dark because their managers objected to pay the window tax; water was costly and therefore scantily supplied; sanitation, as we understand it, did not exist in those days anywhere, least of all in gaols. Pauper prisoners, by far the largest proportion, were nearly starved, for there was no regular allowance of food; their beds, of old littered straw, reeked with filthy exhalations; if they were ill the doctors feared to approach them; chaplains held aloof, and the dying

were left to the ministrations of an occasional self-devoted layman. Worse even than the cruel neglect of the authorities was the active oppression exercised by the stronger over the weaker prisoners; there were gaol customs, such as that of "garnish" or "footing," exacted from new comers who were called upon to "pay, or strip." In default their clothes were torn off their backs and they were left naked to eke out a wretched existence, forbidden to approach the fire, to lie on the straw, or share in the daily doles of food made by the charitable.

Imprisonment for Debt.

It must be borne in mind that most of the inmates of gaols were not even criminals. Debtors formed a very large proportion of the population; the victims, that is to say, of the existing commercial code which gave the creditor his debtor's body but no chance of recovering his debt. These debtors often brought their families with them, and the already limited space was further crowded by weak and unoffending women and children. Untried prisoners made up the rest of the numbers incarcerated; people still innocent in the eyes of the law, whose detention was only defensible on the ground that they must be produced to plead, and who yet, under the apathy of judges and the rarity of gaol deliveries, rotted in gaol for years awaiting trial and possible acquittal. To those actually found guilty the law gave but a short shrift. Prisoners did not long cumber the gaols when once they received sentence; all who were not hanged out of hand were sold into servitude, were sent to hard labour on the American plantations to endure hideous tortures under a semi-tropical sun with no hope of emancipation under seven or fourteen years. The price of one of these white slaves was £20, and the contractors who traded in this human flesh often complained that their merchandise was so much deteriorated by ill-usage as to entail serious loss upon them. Howard found these wretched "transports" awaiting deportation in prisons chained to the floor. Many were kept under the most abject conditions in hulks on the Thames, and an extraordinary mortality prevailed amongst them always.

White Slavery.

Happily Howard's crusade against prison mismanagement and its shortcomings soon produced tangible results. The matter was taken up by Parliament, and the energetic

philanthropist was examined at the bar of the House. Some few public spirited people did their best to apply a remedy at once. The Duke of Richmond built a new prison for Sussex under Howard's advice and guidance; others were erected on an improved plan for Oxford, Stafford, and Gloucester, by which some of the worst evils were removed. A more comprehensive scheme of reform, one of which indeed contained the germ of our best modern practice, was contemplated by the Government, and its execution was to be entrusted to Howard. The great philanthropist was far in advance of his age. While inveighing loudly against the prevailing ill-usage, he yet clearly realised the true principles of criminal treatment as we understand it to-day. These as advocated by him were embodied in an Act, that of 19 Geo. III. c. 74, in which the hope was expressed that "if offenders were ordered to solitary imprisonment accompanied by well regulated hard labour and religious instruction, it might be the means, under Providence, not only of deterring others, but also of reforming individuals and training them to habits of industry."

Howard was no visionary; his philanthropy was practical, the suggestions he made were sound and feasible. It was the main idea in this new and most enlightened scheme to establish Penitentiary Houses in various parts of the country, and these Howard proposed should be built "in a great measure by the convicts themselves." It is remarkable how he foretold our modern practice. There was first to be a boundary, then within the enclosure all the necessary operations were to be carried forward; the foundations were to be dug, bricks made, timber sawn, stone dressed exactly as has been done at Wormwood Scrubbs within the last twenty years. Each prison house was to be spacious, with a sufficient number of separate cells to allow one for every individual; the food was to be ample, the supervision intelligent and reformatory without pauperising or lavishing undue tenderness upon those who had broken the law. Had Howard's views been accepted and borne fruit the movement of prison reform would have been anticipated by at least half a century. But many obstacles interposed to ruin the enterprise; difficulties in obtaining suitable sites delayed it, and then followed dissensions between

The Penitentiary Plan.

Howard and the colleagues associated with him to give effect to the scheme. He at last declined to act, and other supervisors were appointed who actually bought land about Wandsworth, entered into building contracts, and would have begun the work when the Government suddenly stopped all proceedings.

Transportation.

Although the plan of Penitentiary Houses was approved in theory, it had never been very cordially adopted. Really the best and soundest, as we now fully believe it, in those days it was accounted only a *pis aller;* in spite of Howard's warm approval, the Government still preferred exile to a distant land, if that land only could be found. Now the recent discoveries of Captain Cook at the antipodes opened the vast territories of Australasia, in lieu of the lost American colonies, and the Government embarked at once upon a new and more extensive system of transportation beyond the seas. There was something peculiarly attractive in the theory which gave offenders the chance of redeeming misdeeds by becoming useful members of society in a new country, remote from the memories and temptations of the old. Although now quite exploded, this idea still fascinates our neighbours the French, who see only the results, and forget or cannot estimate the evils that transportation entailed. To some minds its admitted failure has been neutralised by the precious jewel it has added to our Colonial crown. It was a means of making men outwardly honest, of converting vagabonds into active citizens, and it has produced Australia. Whether that new and splendid country has so greatly prospered because of transportation or in spite of it need not be now discussed. At least, the colonies themselves condemned it, and since that first great, and no doubt highly successful experiment, it has never again been tried. Of the many and great evils it induced, its extravagant costliness, and its inequality, uncertainty, and general futility as a means of criminal repression, there can be no doubt, and we may have occasion to speak of this again. But these momentous questions belong to a later date.

Bentham's "Panopticon."

Meanwhile, the revival of penal exile on a more guarded, but still objectionable plan, put an end to the Penitentiary Houses. Only one more effort was made, about this time, to follow in Howard's footsteps and give effect to his views. Another

eminent Englishman, Jeremy Bentham (p. 414), devoted himself to prison reform, and in 1791 made a definite proposal to Government to turn prison constructor; he was to erect a Panopticon, or gaol of a peculiar form from plans of his own, and charge himself with the employment, discipline, and control of a certain number of criminals. This Panopticon, or Inspection House, was to be a building so contrived that its inmates could be "kept within reach of being inspected during every moment of their lives." It was to be circular, "a species of iron cage, glazed—a glass lantern as large as Ranelagh, with the cells on the outer-circumference"; this arrangement, assisted by blinds to be let up or down to conceal the warder inspectors, was to constitute a sort of "invisible omnipresence" of authority, by which the criminal himself, in solitude or limited seclusion, yet came under constant supervision. The idea was somewhat far-fetched, but Bentham also contracted to deal fairly with his charges; engaged to give wholesome food, good bedding, sufficient clothing, light, air warmth, and a separate cell. In return for all this he was to have the exclusive right to the products of the prisoners' labour, only his responsibility towards them was not to end with their release. After discharge, he was to find work for them "outside," and by retaining a portion of their prison earnings, he was to lay a foundation stone of a provision for their old age.

Prison reform would indeed have made giant strides had these great promises been kept. But to this day even, although the principles that underlie them are sound, they are not exactly fulfilled. Bentham's scheme was, however, accepted by Parliament, and an Act was passed in 1794 empowering him to proceed. Still the project hung fire, and for many years. Public money was advanced for the preliminary expenses, and Bentham was himself a good deal out of pocket, yet nothing definite was done. He certainly purchased a site for his prison in the district of Tothill Fields, but that was all, except a nearly interminable litigation over the disposal of the Treasury funds. Later, when the proposal to build Penitentiary Houses was revived, Bentham's land was utilised for the erection of the well-known Millbank Penitentiary. This was, in a measure, therefore, the legacy of the Panopticon, but Bentham did no more for prison reform.

Elsewhere in the kingdom, while Howard survived the daily dangers he encountered, the great question was kept alive. The local magistracy were anxious, in many cases, to do their best; but Newgate, the chief prison in London, continued infamously mismanaged, and altogether inadequate for the numbers crowded into it. After Howard's death, the cause of prison reform soon dropped, the old evils revived, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century were everywhere visible. Again and again the voice of philanthropic protest was heard, but none spoke with the energy and directness of Howard. Still, his mantle had fallen on worthy men, such as Neild and Silas Told, while the Quakers of the Eastern counties were soon to do admirable work, headed by Mrs. Fry. Presently, a prison discipline society was started by Fowell Buxton, and, composed of many benevolent and influential people, took the matter in hand. A longer and more consistent effort was now made to compass reform. This movement and its fruits will be dealt with in the next volume.

Howard's Successors.

BURKE, writing of the fateful October 6th, 1789, says that from that day may be dated the most important of all revolutions, "I mean a revolution in sentiments, manners and moral opinions," a revolution which was in his opinion wholly mischievous. He was writing of France, but his words may also be applied to England, for English sentiments, manners and morals were affected by the events which were happening in France, and changed, perhaps, less for the worse than Burke would have us believe.

M. BATESON. Social Life.

Effects of the French Revolution.

Of the revolution in political sentiments Burke's own life is the best example. Overwhelmed with horror at the course of events in France, and believing those events to be the outcome of democratic views, such as he himself once held, he left his former friends to warn the world of "the danger of their wicked principles and black hearts." He carried with him the majority of Englishmen, but he was not immediately followed by Pitt. For another four years Pitt quietly held his

On Political Feeling.

own course, refused to interest himself in French affairs, and devoted his time to England's financial difficulties. But in 1793 he too succumbed to the prevailing influence, and revolutionised himself. With him went many who had withstood the torrent of Burke's eloquence. There still remained a minority, which was swept by the revolutionary tide into an opposite direction. Political parties now divided on a new principle; a democratic party began to form, claiming that "delegated authority was the only legal power," while those who had long been striving against certain class privileges and immunities were inspired by the French example to pursue larger schemes of reform.

Sedition.

The effects of the Revolution can scarcely be separated from those of the war which was its result. The war, with its famine-prices and heavy taxation, excited popular agitations, and these were more or less allied to or confounded with the agitations of constitutional reformers. Both kinds of agitation called forth repressive measures, for the one expressed itself in riots, the other in seditious writings. It was found hard to distinguish the man who attacked a butcher's or a baker's shop, crying "Peace and no Famine" as he forcibly carried off food, from the politician who held merely theoretical opinions on the rights of man. All persons who cried peace were Jacobins and disaffected persons, and the many tumultuous excesses for which the well-affected were responsible were forgotten in the prevailing excitement. The disturbance at Birmingham, excited by the cry of "Church and King" in 1791, reached larger proportions than any excited by the cry of Reform. At Nottingham, too, until the scarcity riots began, there were no tumults or attacks on property but those excited by the Blues or loyalists, who were daily busied in burning Tom Paine's effigy, ducking and pumping on the readers of his works, and smashing the windows of supposed Jacobins.

Causes of Alarm.

In November, 1792, the French Republic issued its Edict of Fraternity, inviting all nations to follow the French example, and promising help to those who obeyed the call. Here was direct encouragement offered to the many democratic societies existing, it was supposed, for one dark purpose or another. It seemed to many that the English Government did well to publish a

proclamation warning people against wicked and seditious writings industriously dispersed among them, and ordering magistrates to prosecute those concerned in issuing them.

Political Societies.

There was known to be a flourishing Revolution Society, and though it existed to commemorate the Revolution of 1688, and not that of 1789, to toast the memory of William III., and not to drink to the fall of kings, its name laid it under suspicion. There was the Society for Constitutional Information and the Society of Friends of the People, both engaged, nominally at least, in working for parliamentary reform. Some of their members advocated universal suffrage, so it was thought not improbable that they were, like the London Corresponding Society, secretly negociating with French Jacobins.

Paine's "Rights of Man."

Paine's book on the "Rights of Man" was known to have an enormous circulation, and he was prosecuted for it under the proclamation of May, 1792. Paine's counsel argued in vain that it had never been held criminal to express opinions on the problems of political philosophy; in vain he dwelt upon his personal disapproval of the theory of human equality; Paine was condemned. A further proclamation was issued stating that the militia must be called out to repress the dangerous spirit of tumult excited by the evil-disposed, who were acting in concert with persons in foreign parts, with the intention to subvert all order and government.

Discovery of Daggers.

Then, as if to prove that the fears of the Government was not unfounded, came the discovery of 3,000 daggers at Birmingham. But in spite of the general alarm, some ventured to think that Burke's "dagger scene" in the House of Commons was a fiasco. The discovery, however, was thought to necessitate the Traitorous Correspondence Act, the object of which was to stop all intercourse between the English and the French; at the same time voluntary societies were formed, and the members made it their business to listen to conversation in public places, in the hope of hearing something of a seditious character, which could be reported and punished. A great conspiracy to overthrow the Government was believed to be on foot in 1794, and then followed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and a number of trials for sedition. The

juries were remarkably fortunate in excluding seditious persons from their number, for unanimous verdicts were obtained upon the slenderest thread of evidence.

In October, 1795, the king's carriage was pelted by the mob as he was on his way to open Parliament, amid cries of "Give us bread! No war! No famine!" for the war had begun to make itself felt among the poor. There followed a new Statute of Treasons, dispensing with proof of any overt act of treason, and also a Seditious Meetings Bill, which forbade any meeting of more than fifty persons to be held without previous notice to a magistrate, who was to attend and prosecute any speaker whose words tended to excite hatred or contempt towards the Government.

Attack on the King.

In 1797 Fox moved for the repeal of these Acts, arguing that "in proportion as opinions are open they are innocent and harmless," but in vain, for although all fear of a revolution in England was over, the industrial revolution called for suppression. Bad harvests and the closing of foreign markets had raised the price of corn at the beginning of 1796 to 79s. a quarter. The changes in the nature of manufacturing industries, and the consequent hardships endured by those who were thrown out of employment increased the number of malcontents. In 1799 accordingly came the Corresponding Societies Act, which made all societies unlawful which held secret proceedings or required their members to take an oath, and with it came the Act against Combinations, which was directed against Trade Unions.

Industrial Disturbance.

The Combination Acts, hastily passed in 1799 and 1800, say nothing concerning the circumstances which called them forth, but from their terms it is clear that they were required to suppress the trade unions forming among the textile workers of Yorkshire and Lancashire. The object of the unions was to enforce the unrepealed laws of the Tudors, especially the Statute of 5 Elizabeth c. 4, which required the seven years' apprenticeship. After the Institution had been formed at Halifax, 1796, the journeymen became aware of the protection which the old laws gave them against the intrusion of workers who had served no apprenticeship. The unions undertook to prosecute employers breaking the old law, and

Act against Trade Unions.

endeavoured to fix a minimum scale of wages. To prevent this, the Combination Acts made all trade combinations illegal, whether on the part of the masters or of the men. The journeymen calico-printers alone entered a protest, urging that "no one journeyman or workman will be safe in holding any conversation with another on the subject of his trade or employment," but their complaint was not heard.

Scarcity Riots.

As yet, however, the popular agitation on the subject of trade and wage regulations did not express itself in violent acts. Even among the frame-work knitters, who were in a state of chronic disturbance after the rejection of the proposed Bill to regulate their wages (1779) there had been no violence since 1790. Nearly all the riots that took place in large towns at the end of the century were not trade but scarcity riots. In 1800, wheat being at 115s. 11d. the quarter, popular discontent was at its height. It was not only the price of bread that had risen, in seven years the price of meat, butter, and sugar, had doubled.

In Nottingham, in spite of a large public subscription for the relief of distress, the food stalls in the market-place were attacked, and the granaries at the canal wharves were broken open. "It was really distressing to see with what famine-impelled eagerness many a mother bore away corn in her apron to feed her offspring." The volunteers were called out to quell the disturbance. In London there was continued rioting, with breaking of windows and attacks on corn-dealers. Popular hatred was directed chiefly against the "forestallers, regraters and engrossers" of corn and meat. Forestallers were persons who anticipated the market by buying goods outside; regraters bought to sell again in the same market; engrossers bought standing corn. The poor believed that the rise in the price of corn was entirely due to the action of these persons, who were buying corn cheap and holding it back to raise the price. The judges encouraged the people in this belief. Chief Justice Kenyon congratulated the jury when a verdict against a forestaller was brought in, saying, "You have conferred by your verdict almost the greatest benefit on your country that was ever conferred by any jury." Numbers of associations were formed to prosecute those who could be charged with offences under the old Acts. In September, 1800, when the quartern loaf was at 1s. 9d., a great meeting

was planned to assemble at the London Corn Market, the handbills declaring that bread would be at 6d. a quartern if a sufficient number assembled. "Fellow countrymen," the address runs, "how long will you quietly and cowardly suffer yourselves to be imposed upon and half-starved by a set of mercenary slaves and Government hirelings? Can you still suffer them to proceed in their extensive monopolies while your children are crying for bread? No! Let them exist not a day longer. We are the sovereignty, rise then from your lethargy," and so forth. About 2,000 gathered at Mark Lane, hissing mealmen and corn factors, and pelting Quakers. The Lord Mayor appeared and read the Riot Act, constables charged the mob, which did not finally disperse till the Tower Ward Volunteers and East India House Volunteers cleared the streets. After this the Lord Mayor issued notices requesting London citizens to keep away from the windows and to stay in their back rooms when the military were ordered out to quell tumultuous assemblies. In November it was believed that a great meeting of mechanics was to gather on Kennington Common. The Privy Council hastily met to consider measures to suppress it; when the time came the common was peopled with police and military and the assembly was nowhere to be found. The quartern loaf was at 1s. 10½d. when at last peace was declared, and then for a while all was quiet.

Effect of the Revolution on Manners.

There were revolutions in popular sentiments, there were also revolutions in manners. Foreign travel was impossible, so it became fashionable to go to the sea-side, to Margate, Weymouth, or to Brighthelmstone, as Brighton was then called. Since the royal family set the example, it was easy to believe in the merits of sea-bathing. When the income-tax fell at the rate of £20 on an income of £200, it was not possible to indulge in expensive amusements.

Food.

The scarcity of flour necessitated a change of diet. In July, 1795, the Privy Council implored all families to abjure puddings and pies, and declared their own intention to have only fish, meat, vegetables, and household bread, made partly of rye. It was recommended that one quartern loaf per head per week should be a maximum allowance. The loaf was to be brought on the table for each to help himself, that none be wasted.

The king himself had none but household bread on his table. The rich were recommended to make no soups or gravies, to take only the prime cuts, and leave the others that the poor might buy them. The poor were to be taught to make soup and rice-pudding. Rice was a new and as yet little used commodity, and the Government agreed to give such a bounty on its sale that its price should never exceed 35s. a hundredweight. In 1801 the Government offered bounties on the importation of all kinds of grain and flour, and passed the Brown Bread Act (1800) forbidding the sale of wheaten bread, or new bread of any kind, as stale bread would go further.

Dress.

The scarcity of flour, together with Pitt's tax on powder (1795) caused a total change in the personal appearance of both sexes, for men ceased to wear powdered wigs, and women had no more powdered "heads." Both sexes allowed the natural hair to be seen. This was but part of the revolution in dress that took place between 1784 and 1795. As Fox had led the fashion in his macaroni, red-heeled-shoe days, he led it when carelessness of dress became the mode. Wraxall's "Memoirs" speak explicitly on this point, and his evidence may be trusted. "Mr. Fox and his friends, who might be said to dictate to the town, affecting a style of neglect about their persons, and manifesting a contempt for all the usages hitherto established, first threw a sort of discredit on dress." From Brooks's Club, the club of the opposition, "it spread through the private assemblies of London." White's, the Government club, had no control over fashion. Even the Prince of Wales wore Fox's famous Westminster colours, blue and buff, and although it is little likely that he ever showed a contempt for neatness in dress, he wore the blue and buff morning-dress on occasions when full dress would at one time have been required. Court-dress and swords had been the rule in Parliament till Fox sat in top-boots and a great-coat. When the Coalition Ministry of 1783 was formed, Lord North's full dress and Blue Ribbon looked out of place "among the great-coats, buff waistcoats, and dirty boots of his new allies." Swords being no longer worn in Parliament, they ceased to be worn at social gatherings. The plebeian umbrella displaced the clouded cane, and gentlemen could walk in the streets protected from the weather without calling immediately for a

chair or a coach. Fox was the first to propose the tax on hair powder to Pitt, and long before his suggestion was accepted he renounced its use. "But," Wraxall says, "though gradually undermined and insensibly perishing of an atrophy, dress never totally fell till the era of Jacobinism and of Equality, 1793–1794."

Men's Hair.

Already in 1791 Walpole wrote, "I do not know the present generation by sight," the young men "in their dirty shirts and shaggy hair have levelled nobility as much as the mobility in France have." He finds that the result of the revolt against wigs is that "all individuality is confounded," when to modern eyes it would first seem to have been restored. It was, however, still only the younger and wilder spirits that wore the hair short. They went by the name of the Crop Club, or the Bedford Crops, because in a famous scene at Woburn Abbey the Duke of Bedford and a party of young noblemen formally renounced the use of powder, and retired to the "powdering-room" to have their heads washed and cropped.

Tail-Coats and Pantaloons.

A change in the cut of breeches and coats was obvious at least as early as 1785, when knee-breeches, buckled at the knee, were no longer worn by those anxious to be in the latest fashion. Instead pantaloons were worn, buttoned or tied with long strings below the knee, at first as far down as the middle of the calf, where they were met by Hessian boots, and in 1793 they had reached the ankle. The buckled knee-breeches were still used at Court, where now for the first time superannuated fashions reigned. It was not there that the close-fitting buckskin breeches were to be seen, nor anything else that was "immense taste." There shoe-buckles were still worn, and not "the unmanly shoestring" which had come in to the dismay of the Birmingham buckle-makers.

The wide-skirted coat had shown a tendency to slope more and more both upwards and downwards from the waist, where it fastened with one button. In 1786 the "sparrow-tail" began, and before long none but tail-coats were worn by the beaus and the bucks. The side pockets, once with wide flaps, were now set close together at the back, with little or no flap; cuffs and collars were small. On dress occasions coat and breeches were made of striped silks. Brown and blue stripes,

mulberry-colour, or dark olive were used. The waistcoat was of white silk, richly embroidered. The Ranelagh frock-coat of plain or corded tabinet (between cloth and silk) was for ordinary wear. A coat and waistcoat of superfine cloth, in 1795, cost £3 8s.; Florentine or satin waistcoat and breeches, £3 3s.; Cassimere waistcoat and breeches, £1 16s.; Manchester cotton breeches, from 16s. upwards. A very fashionable out-door coat was the Spencer, so called from Earl Spencer's bet, in 1792, that he would wear a coat which should become the fashion. It reached only to the waist, and showed the coat-tails below. In complete contrast to it was the "thread-paper," a long close great coat with "watchman's capes," resembling a Newmarket coat in cut. In 1800 the "Jean de Bry" coats were in date. They were padded on the shoulders, and fastened with three large buttons. They were cut too short to reach the trousers in front, and a smart waistcoat filled the gap. Bunches of seals dangled from the two fobs; one fob was out of fashion. No lace or embroidery was any longer worn; shirt-ruffles were behind the fashion. The coat now buttoned higher, and a large muslin cravat was worn, either tied in a loose bow or swathed in many folds about the neck, and almost covering the chin.

High Hats.

In masculine dress length, not width, was the rule, and the long breeches and long coats brought with them the tall hat in place of the three-cornered hat. The "sugar-loaf" hat had a small flat brim, and was made of beaver or of silk in dark colours. Then, to make his costume complete, the buck required his "quizzing-glass."

Countryman's Dress.

But it was not in this costume that the ordinary citizen or the countryman went to his business. The wide-skirted coat and knee-breeches were still the ordinary wear. At a shop for ready-made clothes the average price for a great-coat was 13s.; a waistcoat, 6s. 6d.; stout breeches, 3s. 9d.; stockings, 1s. 9d.; dcwlas shirt, 4s. 6d.; strong shoes, 7s.; a hat "to last three years," 2s. 6d. Linens and cambrics were still comparatively high in price. A woman's shift was 3s. 8d., when a stuff gown was only 6s. 6d. A linsey-woolsey petticoat was 4s. 6d.; pair of shoes, 3s. 9d.; stays "to last six years," 6s.; and a hat of the cheaper sort, 1s. 8d.

Women's Dress.

In the dress of fashionable women the short transition stage from the extreme of artificiality to the extreme of simplicity is believed to have been due to the influence of the portrait-painters. In 1785 Leghorn picture-hats and hair in curls began to replace the huge "mobs" and "heads." In 1788 the hoop was small, the bodice tight and very low, the bust being covered by the "buffont" white muslin kerchief. Then came the classical period, certainly traceable to French influences. The long ringlets were confined *à la victime*, or *à la guillotine;* the dress fell from the shoulders and disregarded the waist. The "Caroline wrapper" of 1795 resembled a carter's smock; if the waist was indicated at all it was by a sash under the armpits. Only flimsy stuffs were suitable for dresses of this cut, and to secure a diaphanous "aërial" appearance the weather was wholly disregarded, and drapery was adopted which Wraxall says was more suitable to the climate of Greece or Italy. The Greek honeysuckle pattern or borders from Pompeian furniture were the favourite trimmings. Gloves to the elbow or mittens and a scarf were the protection allowed out of doors, and while the body was thus scantily clad the head and face were closely covered, at first in the "peasant bonnet" tied under the chin over a "mob," and later in a poke-bonnet with a "valence" or pendant lace curtain, little in harmony with the wearer's supposed classical appearance. Madame de Récamier had too much sense of congruity to dress thus. In 1802 she created some sensation in Kensington Gardens when she appeared dressed *à l'antique* in muslin which "clung to her form like the folds of the drapery on a statue; her hair in a plait at the back, and falling in small ringlets round her face, and greasy with *huile antique;* a large veil thrown over the head." In evening dress English women completed the Grecian or Roman coiffure by a *panache*, or bristle-plume, or a bunch of feathers standing erect in front. The "buffont" kerchief went out, and for a short time it became the fashion to wrap the neck up to the chin in folds of muslin in imitation of a man's cravat. This was succeeded in 1795 by the low-necked bodice exposing the shoulders. As the waist was placed abnormally high, the bodice measured only two or three inches in depth.

Effect of the Revolution on Morals.

With this total change in externals there came also that revolution in "moral opinions" of which Burke speaks. Even the changes in a fashionable woman's dress serve in some ways to show it. The movement in dress was in part a movement from artificiality to simplicity, and in morals it was paralleled by that simplification of life which the national poverty necessitated. In a sense, it is true, female dress merely passed from one form of artificiality to another; the same may be said of the nation's ideas of morality. Till 1793 the prosperity of the nation had so steadily grown that the sufferings caused by the war were the more severely felt by all classes. The manufacturers whose industries were developing, and the farmers who had corn to sell, alone escaped. Intellectually and morally the upper and middle classes were affected by what they endured. When the news of the death of Louis XVI. reached England, the audiences left the theatres before the curtain fell, the nation put on mourning. And so in the years that followed; Ranelagh is heard of no more, its masquerades were at an end, and in 1803 it finally closed. The Pantheon promenades and masquerades and operas were over; it was still used for concerts and lectures till 1812, when it was taken down.

Places of Amusement.

Gambling.

Popular feeling was now for the first time excited against gambling. In 1796 Chief Justice Kenyon, in giving sentence at a trial to recover £15 won by gambling, threatened that he would set in the pillory any who were brought before him for gambling, "though they be the first ladies in the land." Thereupon Gillray (p. 569) caricatured two ladies whose Faro banks were notorious as "Pharaoh's daughters," standing in the pillory. In 1797 Lady Buckinghamshire, Lady Elizabeth Luttrell, and others were summoned for playing at Lady Buckinghamshire's house in St. James's Square. They were fined £50, and not condemned to the pillory; but from this time gambling was no longer public and reputable. At a time when so many stirring events were happening, conversation was more interesting than cards. Political excitement began to take the place of "pleasure" and "diversion" in the social world. There were military, naval, parliamentary, financial, and literary careers to be made, and

made quickly. It was a time to rouse ambition in young men, who now found themselves compelled to act, not to travel with a tutor, educating themselves to gain distinction as professional idlers. It was a time of great inventions, a time when genius in whatever class it was found quickly gained reward.

Philanthropy.

Never were the sufferings of the poor more patent to the casual observer. It was impossible that philanthropic and humanitarian schemes should not be in the air. Thinkers were devoting their minds to the new problems which the state of the industrial world required men to face. Political economists sought to solve them, and charitable persons sought to alleviate the distress. It was an age of both voluntary and involuntary self-denial. Besides philanthropic schemes for temporary relief there were schemes for educating the poor in habits of thrift, and numerous savings-banks and friendly societies were started. The missionary societies renewed their activity: in 1808 the British and Foreign School Society began. Sunday Schools were everywhere established. The sufferings of children began to excite sympathy; in 1803 an "Association for improving the situation of infant Chimney-sweepers" was formed.

Society for the Reformation of Manners.

The strict observance of Sunday had the support of nearly all the advanced moralists of that day. As if to show that the reformers of 1800 stood exactly where the reformers of 1700 stood (IV., p. 592), there was Wilberforce's new society with the old title "for the Reformation of Manners," and an "Association for the Better Observance of the Sabbath." In 1787 the king had issued a proclamation against vice, as William and Mary had done before him. Wilberforce seized the moment to start his society. He found the Archbishop of Canterbury "deeply impressed with the torrent of profaneness which every day makes more rapid advances." Both archbishops and all the bishops joined, six dukes, and many of the nobility. The society no longer encountered any hostility.

It was a serious, self-conscious time, a time when seriousness of purpose told to the full. Finish of manner was at a discount, but an outward moral decorum was expected. "Private indulgences" were suffered so long as the public was not insulted by their exhibition. In 1768 a few persons "of

delicacy" had considered it shocking that the Duke of Grafton, then First Lord of the Treasury, should lead his mistress, Nancy Parsons, in triumph before the queen. In 1802 Fox had to announce his marriage to Mrs. Armistead before she could be received in society. Even the vices of the Prince of Wales and of the Duke of York were considered matter for regret.

J. COLVILLE. Scotland.

The Dundas Régime, 1783-1803.

The appointment of Henry Dundas as Lord Advocate (1775) had introduced to power the most remarkable man Scotland had yet given to the political life of the kingdom. He came of an old Mid-Lothian stock that, for the three immediately preceding generations, had won for itself the highest distinctions of bench and bar. Until his fall and impeachment in 1805, by which time he had been made Viscount Melville, he ranked in public notice with Pitt, Fox, and Burke. He won his spurs as a debater in resisting all compromise with armed colonists in America. The admirer and friend of Pitt, he stood by him stoutly through the summer of 1783 in facing the attacks of the powerful Whig Opposition. Whether as Treasurer of the Navy, War Secretary, or First Lord of the Admiralty, he was the life and soul of the national defence, earning indeed almost the entire credit for the successful Egyptian campaign. Throughout he was a tower of strength to the triumphant Tories. The first move towards parliamentary reform, Dunning's resolution on the growing power of the Crown (1780), was opposed by him; and when the French Revolution quickened the forward movement, he proved himself a thorough Anti-Jacobin. In Scotland his repressing hand was most effective. A mere fraction of the population could exercise the franchise. Self-elected town councillors would meet in some dingy corner of their Tolbooths and quietly choose their members as Dundas ordered. In counties *parchment barons* on a bogus qualification swamped the legitimate freeholders. The election of 1790, when his power was at its height, passed with but nine county contests. The total county electorate was then 2,652. Edinburgh was the only burgh with a member to herself, and he was elected by thirty-two votes. The control of the elections was easy for a minister whose position gave him

the patronage of hundreds of good posts at home and abroad. Cockburn calls him "the Pharos of Scotland: whoever steered on him was safe." There was no political sentiment abroad; public spirit slept the sleep of indifference. Great writers like Robertson and Blair, philosophers like Hume and Adam Smith, scientists like Maclaurin, Cullen, and Black, all being voteless, stood absolutely outside the public life of the country. During the last decade of the eighteenth century the statistical accounts were drawn up by nearly a thousand parish ministers, not one of whom expresses dissatisfaction with the political situation. But for a few poor visionaries and discontented Dissenters, Scotland would be the best of all worlds.

Burgh and Parliamentary Reform.

The bogeys of Atheism, Jacobinism, and invasion were powerful aids to the rule of Dundas. They staved off the two pressing questions of the hour—burgh and parliamentary reform. As early as 1783 artisans and small traders were agitating for reform of abuses in burghs, and in 1787 an appeal was made to the parliamentary leaders. Pitt gave no answer, whereas Fox and Sheridan offered eager support. But Dundas always resisted such a blow to his influence, and his attitude was the only unpopular one in the whole course of his career in the eyes of the mass of his countrymen. The question was shelved for the more important one of parliamentary reform. It was in this cause that the first blow was struck at the power of Dundas. The Jacobin movement found a response in the Association of the Friends of the People. The Scottish Branch, at a meeting in Glasgow (1792) pledged itself to equal representation and shorter parliaments. Government had spies everywhere. Even Dugald Stewart's lectures at Edinburgh University on "Political Economy" were suspiciously watched by the Crown officials. Dundas urged his nephew, the Lord Advocate, to adopt strong measures. Obsequious juries, under the notorious Judge Braxfield, eagerly disposed of the leaders of the people. Muir, vice-president of the Association, the friend of Barras, Condorcet and Lafayette, and a gentle, humane, and cultured member of the Scottish Bar, was sentenced to fourteen years' transportation. Fysshe Palmer, a Dundee clergyman, was banished for seven years. Skirving, secretary to the Society of United Scots, and Gerald and Margarot, English delegates, were

transported for fourteen years. Their friends, Sheridan, Whitehead, and Fox, with Stanhope in the Lords, fought hard to save them, but Government was too strong. The saddest feature of such political martyrdom was the panic, following on the long-sustained deadening of public opinion, that blinded the outlook of the moneyed and governing classes to the real condition of the nation, and led judges and juries alike into senseless repression of which the right thinking were speedily to become ashamed. The State trials hastened reform and strengthened the Whig opposition, which had survived the rule of Dundas. The brothers Erskine formed the life and soul of this party. Thomas, while at the English Bar, from which he rose to be Lord Chancellor, was one of the original fifty "Friends of the People," and defended Tom Paine on his trial. His brother Henry remained in their native Edinburgh, where his Whiggism excluded him from public life and the highest rewards of his profession, despite the beauty of his character and the wit and eloquence of which his countrymen were so proud. The Tory reign fostered a generation of privileged mediocrities, whereas the cold shades of opposition produced the band that founded the *Edinburgh Review* (1802; p. 590), Brougham, Jeffrey, Horner, and Sydney Smith.

The Scottish Whigs.

A treatise would not exhaust the marvellous story of the making of industrial Scotland. The first solid start in material progress came with the close of the Seven Years' War (1763). Pioneers had been at work here and there ever since the union under the impetus of Dutch and English examples. The Duchess of Gordon, daughter of the Earl of Peterborough, was the first to bring ploughs from the South and men used to the new methods of sowing grasses, making hay, planting waste lands, draining morasses. On the Borders a ploughboy, Dawson, applied lessons which, in a spirit of adventure, he had travelled to learn under Bakewell (p. 301), and about 1764 sowed seventy acres of turnips. In the same district the famous judge, Lord Kames, began his career as the most notable of improvers. With every step forward he was directly or indirectly connected. Colonies of veteran soldiers were tried (1752–57) on his reclaimed lands in Perthshire, but without success. The poor feudal tenants, however, driven out of the

Rise of Industry: Agriculture.

upland straths, were turned to excellent account. Kames did more: his *Gentleman Farmer* (1777) marked an era in agricultural progress. To him is also due the first technical instruction in husbandry, when he selected Wight, a Mid-Lothian farmer (1773–74), to report on the annexed estates. His six volumes (1778–84) form a business-like, intelligent, and extremely interesting picture of this period of momentous change. Kames planned the Board of Agriculture which Sir John Sinclair realised, and founded the Highland Society (1784). The Statistical Accounts and the County Reports of the last decade of the century show that an eager spirit of progress was abroad among intelligent landholders. Rural life and customs were being revolutionised, and cultivators of the old school like Robert Burns had to go to the wall. Meikle's threshing-mill (1787) soon superseded the flail, saving at least one per cent. of the total produce of the country, while Small's plough, in full vogue about the same date, banished for ever its old ox-drawn cumbrous rival. The marketing that followed new wants and increased production soon produced made roads instead of bridle-paths, and neat carts to take the place of clumsy sleds and wooden-wheeled wagons. In spite of all this the Highlands and the Isles remained till quite recently in their primitive condition. Climate, inaccessibility, over-population fostered by a vicious land system, the pride and poverty of landlords—these all contributed to this result. The middlemen, or tacksmen, who had so long secured the advantages going, were driven out with the rise of rents and the decay of clan sentiment. The landless peasants, long virtually serfs, had to emigrate in thousands to find a Caledonia in the virgin forests of New England and the lower St. Lawrence. The advent of sheep-farming (1767) hastened emigration, and secured big money rents. The change was attended with little agrarian disturbance. In 1792 there was a blind spasmodic rising in Easter Ross to drive the sheep into the sea, but it was easily suppressed. The much-debated Sutherland evictions (1812–4) made a great sensation. They were the outcome of well-meant efforts to settle the dispossessed peasantry in fishing villages newly-erected; but the farmer-fisher proved a failure, and the Highland question is not yet settled.

The Highlands.

Fiscal Laws.

Fiscal laws sorely hampered local industry. The heavy taxes and intolerable restrictions on the movement of salt, coal, corn, wool, made all coast-dwellers daring and active smugglers. The expenses of collection exceeded the total revenue. Only about one-third of the salt dues went into the public purse. The social and industrial discomfort made government odious, while the general demoralisation was pernicious in the extreme.

Manufactures.

Despite unwise legislation industry developed by dint of energy and intelligence. Under such native guidance as that of Forbes and Kames and a band of self-sacrificing improvers, the face of the country was so altered that, according to a contemporary, one returning to Scotland in 1800 after forty years' absence would find his direction only by the neighbouring hills. The Board of Linen Manufacturers (1727) fostered the time-honoured industry of the fireside by premiums on the finished stuffs, the annual value of which rose from £293,864 in 1748 to £936,453 in 1805, diffusing valuable resources among many industrial villages. The British Fishery Society (1786) strove to create the net and line fishing in deep waters, paying bounties till 1830. But the greatest triumphs in industry were won by Glasgow. Provost Ingram established the first calico print-field at Pollokshaws in 1742, and before the end of the century there were thirty in and around the city. The inventions of Hargreaves, Crompton, and Arkwright led, about 1785, to the cotton industry and a vast trade in muslins. David Dale, a practical philanthropist of advanced type, secured land about this time on the estates of Judge Braxfield, and with Arkwright's help laid out the novel industrial village of New Lanark, near the Falls of Clyde. His water mill was the first of the kind in the island. Here he made use of the labour of the expatriated Highlanders, boarding the young in barracks and employing teachers to instruct them at a time when elementary education was thought a distracting luxury. Rapidly cotton mills were set up wherever labour and water power were to be had. When Arkwright's patent ran out (1785) a fresh start was possible. Watt had made his first model in 1763 in a room of his house near the Broomielaw in Glasgow, and when a fellow citizen* worked the mule

* Robert Muir was the first to make an engine in Glasgow for moving

jenny by machinery instead of hand labour (1792), Watt applied steam to the process, so that Todd was able in the same year to spin cotton by the new motor. Before 1818 there were fifty-four cotton mills, with 600 spindles, in and around the city. Robert Miller of Glasgow patented a power-loom in 1796, and a factory was at once set going with 200 looms. Dyeing grew up alongside of cotton-weaving, and with it is identified the name of Mackintosh, famous for his water-proofing process. Finding a Rouen dyer, Papillon by name, in London, he took him north (1785), and with the help of Dale set up the Turkey Red industry. The population of Glasgow, at the rise of the cotton industry (1785) only 45,889, rose to 147,197 in 1819, the date of the first exact enumeration of the inhabitants. The spirit of enterprise spread to other towns, Paisley being the most successful imitator of Glasgow with its thread, tape, and gauze. Here, in 1785, many houses paid as much as £500 a week in wages. Dundee began to import much flax from Holland and the Baltic for coarse linen and sailcloth. A Quaker from Glasgow established (1735) bleaching and dyeing in Perth, where the trade has vastly flourished. Dunfermline gave up ticking for diapers about 1750, and by 1792 had 1,200 looms at work. In Aberdeenshire there was an enormous development of stocking-knitting and pork-pickling for the Navy. Even remote Shetland turned out stockings to the annual value of £17,000 (1801). Mineral wealth was not overlooked. At Cramond, near Edinburgh, Cadell had long forged Swedish iron by water-power. The works were erected in Carron (1760) for the manufacture of native ore, and rapidly the iron industry extended into Lanarkshire. Newer methods had to be employed to reach the deeper seams of coal. At Shettleston the first engine for drawing water from pits (1764) marks the beginning of such efforts.

P. W. JOYCE. Ireland.

AFTER 1782 the only connection between the Parliaments of England and Ireland was that they had the same Sovereign for head. "Grattan's Parliament" was completely independent, and was

machinery. It was started in a cotton mill in 1792. Watt's engine was first used for spinning cotton at Manchester in 1789 (p. 463).

absolutely free to make any laws it pleased for Ireland. But it stood sadly in need of internal reform; for, free as it was, it was as bad a type of parliament as could well be conceived. Of the 300 members of the House of Commons, not more than seventy-two were returned by the free votes of the electors; all the rest were, either directly or indirectly, nominated by lords or other powerful persons, who commonly sold the seats for cash at election times. The spurious boroughs fabricated in the times of the Stuarts (IV., p. 195) still existed, whose electors, being very few, could easily be brought up when the Government wanted one of their own supporters elected. And lastly, the Roman Catholics, the great bulk of the people, were wholly unrepresented. The Parliament did not represent the nation; it did not represent even the Protestant people. It contained within itself the elements of decay and dissolution, which nothing but a thorough reform could avert.

The two antagonistic parties still subsisted, with the line of cleavage as distinctly marked as ever. The Patriotic Party were eager for Parliamentary reforms; the Government party obstinately resisted reform of every kind; and by means of the corrupting influences at their command they were generally able to secure a majority. The Volunteers took up the question; and in 1783 Flood brought in a Bill embodying their demands; but the Government proved too strong; and after some violent scenes the Bill was rejected. There were now fears of a collision between the Volunteers and the Government; but through the influence of Lord Charlemont the convention was adjourned without any day being fixed for next meeting. This was the death blow to the influence of the Volunteers, who never again took any leading part in the political affairs of the country.

Parliamentary and Commercial Reform.

Though many of the ruinous restrictions on Irish trade had been removed, there were still enormous prohibitory duties on Irish goods exported to England, and but little or none on English goods brought to Ireland; a state of things which greatly repressed all that remained of Irish manufacture and commerce. On this point the Irish Government were for reform; but when their very moderate proposals were brought by Pitt before the English Parliament in 1785, a violent out-

cry was raised all over England by companies, manufacturers, and merchants, who insisted on maintaining the unjust monopolies that enriched themselves and impoverished Ireland; so that the whole scheme fell through.

The liberation of the Irish Parliament had no effect whatever in ameliorating the condition of the country; the same causes continued to produce the same effects; and distress and discontent prevailed everywhere. Secret societies again arose among the peasantry, and the whole country began to be fearfully disturbed. In the South there was a revival of the White-boys. In the North there were "Peep-o-day Boys," all Protestants and Presbyterians, who directed their hostilities chiefly against Catholics, while the Catholics, on their part, banded themselves as "Defenders"; and battles were fought in which numbers on both sides were maimed or killed. Grattan moved, in Parliament, for inquiry with a view to remedy, but he was overborne; and instead of this the Government had a crushing Insurrection Bill passed in 1787, which was followed by the usual crop of transportations and executions; after which, instead of improving, matters became worse than before.

Social Disturbance.

About 1790 the minds of the higher classes began to be stirred profoundly by the French Revolution. Clubs were formed in Dublin and Belfast, whose publications and speeches exposed unsparingly the evil systems and the corruption of the Government; but the Government was inexorable, and never deviated from its course. Lord Charlemont, Lord Moira, Hamilton Rowan, Theobald Wolfe Tone, and Napper Tandy, all belonging to the Protestant gentry, were members of these clubs. In 1791 Tone founded the Society of United Irishmen, in Belfast, which was to include all classes and religions in its ranks; its chief fundamental objects, which were quite legal, being to break down the corrupting influence of the Government by Parliamentary reform, and to remove the disabilities of all religious persuasions.

The United Irishmen.

The association called the "Catholic Committee," composed of the leading Catholics of Dublin, had been in existence for many years. Their purpose was to look after the Catholic interests in general, and especially to obtain the repeal of the

remaining penal statutes; but beyond this they did not mix themselves up much in any political movements. Considerable success attended their efforts. In 1793 a Bill was passed through the Irish Parliament restoring the franchise to the Catholics, opening up to them almost all situations, civil and military, and granting them permission to open colleges. But several heavy restrictions still remained, the most serious of which was that no Catholic could be a Member of Parliament.

The leading spirits among the United Irishmen were now very active both in Dublin and Belfast, held meetings and circulated bold addresses, for which some of them were prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. Secret negotiations were carried on regarding a French invasion, the chief agent being the Rev. William Jackson, a Protestant clergyman. But there were spies among the body, and the Government were made aware of all their plans. Jackson was arrested, tried, and condemned; but he managed to take a dose of arsenic and dropped dead in the dock. Hamilton Rowan, who was also implicated, escaped to America.

Towards the end of 1794, William Pitt took measures to have the Catholics of Ireland completely emancipated; and with this object in view, Earl Fitzwilliam, a just, liberal, and enlightened man, was sent over as lord-lieutenant, which caused great joy in Ireland. He at once applied himself to the task, and with his concurrence, an Emancipation Bill was brought in by Grattan, early in 1795. But an unexpected obstacle disconcerted the whole intended reform. The King, persuaded it seems by certain mischief-makers from Ireland that the Protestant religion was in danger, interposed his veto and stopped the whole measure. Fitzwilliam was recalled, and the bad old policy of force and coercion was resumed. Whatever may have been the cause, that cruel disappointment spread sorrow and indignation, not only among Catholics, but among Protestants; and it was in great measure answerable for the tremendous evils that followed.

The people were now exasperated and desperate, and they resolved to attempt revolution and the establishment of a Republic. The United Irishmen, abandoning their legal methods, banded themselves as a secret, oath-bound society. Wolfe Tone, compromised by some disclosures, had to leave the country; he went to America with the intention of

negotiating for help from the United States, and from France. In Ulster, as usual, the disturbances took the form of bitter religious strife. The Protestants formed themselves into a new society called Orangemen, openly expressing their determination to expel all the Catholics from Ulster; after which the Catholics were attacked everywhere through the province, and suffered great persecution. Wolfe Tone had long before endeavoured to bring the two religious bodies to a mutual good understanding, but his efforts were unavailing.

One great object of the Government at this time was to prevent the spread of revolutionary doctrines in Ireland; and it did not escape their notice that all young Catholics who aspired to the priesthood were forced to go to France for their education. The Government feared that the young priests might import into Ireland the ideas of the Revolution, to prevent which they founded the College of Maynooth in 1795, with an annual grant of £8,000 for the education of the Catholic clergy.

The United Irishmen continued to increase till they ultimately numbered 100,000; among other important persons, they were joined by Lord Edward Fitzgerald, brother of the Duke of Leinster; and towards the end there were many Catholics among them. In December, 1796, through the influence of Tone, a French fleet of 43 ships of war under General Hoche, with 15,000 troops, and 45,000 stand of arms, sailed for Ireland; but they were dispersed by storms, and only 16 vessels entered Bantry Bay, which, as the wild weather continued, soon returned to France. After this came another Insurrection Act; many of the leaders were arrested; and military, yeomen, and militia were let loose on the country and committed horrible and unspeakable brutalities on the inoffensive peasantry, so that thousands of peaceable people were driven to join the ranks of the United Irishmen. There was another attempt at invasion in 1797, by a Dutch fleet with 15,000 men, under Admiral de Winter; but the expedition, having first been delayed by unsuitable weather, was finally defeated by Admiral Duncan at Camperdown.

The Rebellion of 1798.

The rebels at last determined on action, and fixed on the 23rd of May, 1798, for a general rising. But the spies within their ranks kept the Government well informed of their proceedings. In March,

several of the leaders were arrested, among them Lord Edward Fitzgerald, who received a mortal wound while resisting. Two brothers, Henry and John Sheares, barristers, were arrested, tried, and hanged. When the actual rising came it was only partial, being confined to the counties of Kildare, Wicklow, and Wexford; in this last named county it took a religious character, which it had not elsewhere, and nearly all the rebels were Catholics, though many of their leaders were Protestants. The peasantry of Wexford were a peaceable industrious people, among whom secret societies had made no headway, and who had no wish to rise; but they were driven to rebellion, simply by the terrible barbarities of the military, yeomanry, and more especially of the North Cork militia. They rose up in desperation, without arms, or plan, or leaders, and in their blind fury committed many terrible outrages on the Protestant loyalist inhabitants, in retaliation for the worse excesses of the militia. The Rev. John Murphy, a parish priest, whose little chapel had been burned, at last placed himself at their head; and under his leadership they annihilated a company of the North Cork militia, on the 27th May, at Oulart. On the day previous, a body of 4,000 rebels had been defeated at Tara. The rebels captured Enniscorthy and Gorey, after which they fixed their chief encampment on Vinegar Hill, beside Enniscorthy. On the 30th of May, a detachment of military was attacked and destroyed at the Three Rocks, near Wexford; and the rebels took possession of Wexford, where they drank and feasted, and committed great outrages on those they considered unfriendly to them. While here, they placed at their head, as general, a Protestant gentleman named Bagenal Harvey. In June they took Newtownbarry and New Ross, from both which, however, they were soon after expelled by the military. An irresponsible rabble, flying from New Ross, seized a number of inoffensive loyalist prisoners at a place called Scullabogue, and having murdered 37 of them, followed up the massacre by setting fire to a barn in which the rest—more than 100—were confined, and burned them all to death. The rebels next attempted to march on Dublin, but they were intercepted and defeated at Arklow, by General Needham. On the 21st of June, General Lake marched on their chief encampment at Vinegar Hill, with 20,000 men, and after some hard fighting, defeated and

dispersed the rebels. This virtually ended the rebellion: many of the leaders were arrested and hanged, among them Bagenal Harvey and Father Murphy. The whole country was now at the mercy of the yeomen and militia, who perpetrated dreadful atrocities on the peasantry; while straggling bands of rebels traversed the country free of all restraint, and in retaliation committed terrible outrages.

In the North the rebellion broke out in June. But the rebels were defeated in two battles, and their leaders, Henry Joy McCracken and Henry Munro, were captured and hanged, Munro at his own door.

Lord Cornwallis, a humane and distinguished man, was appointed Lord-Lieutenant in June. He put a stop to the cruel military outrages, and succeeded in restoring some degree of quiet. After the rebellion had been crushed there were two small hostile expeditions from France—still in 1798: one under General Humbert landed at Killala, and the other under Admiral Bompart entered Lough Swilly; but both were repelled without much difficulty. Wolfe Tone, who was on board one of Bompart's vessels, was taken and sent prisoner to Dublin, where he was tried and sentenced to be hanged. But on the morning fixed for the execution he cut his throat with a penknife, and died of the wound a short time afterwards.

William Pitt believed that the proper time had now arrived for carrying out his favourite project of a Parliamentary union of Ireland with England. At this time Lord Cornwallis was Lord-Lieutenant, and Lord Castlereagh Chief Secretary. Under Pitt's directions elaborate preparations were made for passing the measure next session. The Irish Government had been all along corrupt; but corruption was now carried to an extent never experienced before. The proprietors of the "rotten" or "pocket" boroughs were bought off for large sums, the whole amount expended in this part of the business being £1,260,000, which Ireland herself was made to pay. There was bribery everywhere, with scarcely an attempt at concealment; and votes were bought for peerages, promotions in peerage, pensions, judgeships, situations of various kinds, and direct cash. Lord Cornwallis, a high-minded man, expressed the utmost abhorrence at being obliged to take part in such disreputable transactions.

The Union.

The session opened in January, 1800. Grattan, who had been for some time out of Parliament, had himself elected and took his seat. Dublin was in a fearful state of excitement, so that the exasperated crowds had to be kept in check by the military. Lord Castlereagh brought forward the motion for Union; it was opposed most vehemently by the anti-unionists led by Grattan, who pleaded with all his old fire and eloquence, but in spite of all their efforts the measure was carried. The one bright spot in the dark record is that there were over 100 members who stood proof against the corrupting influences, and opposed the project to the last.

In order to lessen the hostility of the Roman Catholics to the measure, it was conveyed to them that the union would be immediately followed by Emancipation. But this promise was not kept; for the Act emancipating the Catholics was not carried till after the lapse of twenty-nine years.

AUTHORITIES.—1784-1802.

GENERAL HISTORY.

Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century;* Sir G. C. Lewis, *Administrations of Great Britain;* Erskine May, *Constitutional History;* Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce;* Bright, *History of England;* Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power on the Wars of the French Revolution;* biographies of Pitt by Lord Stanhope and Lord Rosebery; John Morley, *Burke;* Wakeman, *Charles James Fox;* Wilberforce's *Life.* Among contemporary authorities, Burke, *Reflections on the French Revolution* and *Appeal from the Old to the New Whigs;* Arthur Young's Tours: *Memoirs of the life of Sir Samuel Romilly, Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury, The Grenville Papers.*

SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

Military History.—Seeley, *Expansion of England;* Innes, *Britain and her Rivals;* Norman, *Colonial France;* Malleson, *Decisive Battles in India,* and *Final French Struggles in India;* also his *Dupleix* and *Clive,* "Rulers of India" series; Orme, *History of India;* Lyall, *British Dominion in India; Regimental History of the Madras Fusiliers;* Mahan, *Sea Power* (see above); Wellington, *Supplementary Despatches;* Dundas, *Drill Regulations;* Bunbury, *Narrative of the Campaign in Holland;* Wilson, *Campaign in Egypt;* Elmslie's prize essay in *Journal of United Service Institution,* 1895.

The Navy, 1742-1815.—Dr. John Campbell, *Lives of the British Admirals* (continued by H. R. Yorke and W. Stevenson, 1817); Charnock, *Biographia Navalis* (1798); James, *Naval History of Great Britain* (continued by Chamier, 6 vols., Lond., 1837); Marshall, *Royal Naval Biography; Letters of Sir S. Hood,* 1781-83 (Navy Records Society); E. Thompson, *Sailor's Letters written to his Select Friends* (Ind. ed. 1767); *The History of Edward and Maria* (also by Thompson, published anonymously in the *London Magazine,* 1774-75); the MS. journal of Captain E. Thompson, R.N., ed. Hayman, in *Cornhill Magazine,* May, 1868; Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain* (1804); C. Derrick, *Memoirs of the Rise and Progress of the Royal Navy* (1806); Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power on History* and *Influence of Sea Power on the French Revolution and Empire.*

Exploration 1642-1802.—For Dampier: Harris, *Collection of Voyages;* Hacke, *Voyages* (1699); *Voyage of Captain Bartholomew Sharp*, 1684; Public Record Office, *Minutes of Court-martial*, vol. x., *Captain's Letters* D. L.; British Museum, Sloane MSS., 46A and B, 49, 54, 3236, 3820; but especially Dampier's own narratives, with Funnel's, reprinted in 4 vols., as *Dampier's Voyages*. For Morgan and the earlier Buccaneers: Exquemelin, *Buccaneers of America*, 1654 (partly republished in the "Adventure Series," 1891); British Museum, Add. MSS., 27968; *Present State of Jamaica*, 1683; *Journals of Jamaica Assembly*, vol. i.; *History of Jamaica*, 1774. For Narborough and others, Narborough, *Journal;* Charnock, *Naval Biography*, I. Anson's *Life*, by Sir John Barrow, very unsatisfactory; Walter, *Account of Anson's Voyage round the World* (1748); Pascoe Thomas, *Journal of a Voyage to the South Seas* (1745). For Cook, *cf.* his *Life*, by Kippis in *Biographia Britannica;* Accounts, of his *first* voyage in Hawksworth's *Voyages*, vols. ii. and iii. (1773); of his *second* voyage, by himself, in 2 vols. (1777), and also by George Forster (1777); of his *last* voyage, by himself and King, in 3 vols. (1784); *cf.* also the *Narrative of Cook's Death*, by David Samwell, surgeon of the *Discovery* (1786); British Museum, Egerton MSS., 277A, which contains the *Journal* of his last voyage to 6th January, 1779; Banks' *System of Geography*, and, above all, the new edition of Cook's *Journals* by Wharton, and his Letters among the *Captain's Letters* in the P.R.O. For Bligh, Adams, etc., *see* Belcher's *Mutineers of the Bounty;* Sir T. Barrow, *Mutiny of the Bounty*, 1831; *Notes and Queries*, 1856, 1871, 1872; Marshall's *Royal Naval Biography;* and articles in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. For Bruce, *cf.* his *Travels* (1790); Playfair's *Travels* in footsteps of Bruce (1877) and the *Travels* of Lord Valentia and of Salt, Bruce's chief critics. For Flinders, his *Voyage to Terra Australis* (1814) and his *Observations on the Coasts of Van Dieman's Land*, etc. (1801). For Park, his *Travels* in the *Journal of a Mission to the Interior of Africa* (1815) and Pinkerton's *Collection of Voyages*, vol. xvi.

Church History, 1715-1815.—Atterbury, *Correspondence* and Memoir by Nichols; Coxe, *Walpole Parl. Hist.*, vii., viii., xxviii., xxix.; Secker, *Works*, esp. vol. v.; Leland, *View of the Principal Deistical Writers;* Lathbury, *History of the Non-jurors; Life and Works* of Archdeacon Blackburne; *Lives* of Law, by Overton; Waterland, by Van Mildert; Warburton, by Hurd; Wesley, by Tyerman; Simeon, by Carus; Wilberforce, *History of the American Church;* Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century;* and the excellent summary in Perry, *Church History*, iii., especially the notes and illustrations.

Philosophy.—Bowring, *Life of Bentham* (in his ed. of Bentham's works), shows Bentham's political influences; but much of it was indirect; *cf.* Bain, *Life of James Mill.*

Science, *Medicine*, *Art*, and *Social Life*, as in c. xviii.; *Agriculture* as in c. xvii.; *Manufactures* as in c. xx.

Economic History.—The Journal of the House of Commons and Reports of Parliamentary Committees and Commissions—*e.g.* those on the *Wool Trade* in 1803, 1804, and 1806; on the *Cotton Trade* in 1808 and 1809; on *Finance* and *Currency* in 1797 and 1811. Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce;* Leone Levi, *History of British Commerce;* Tooke, *History of Prices;* Jacob, *Enquiry into the Production and Consumption of the Precious Metals;* Dowell, *History of Taxation;* Aschrott, *English Poor Law System;* Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations;* Malthus, *Essay on the Principle of Population;* Eden, *State of the Poor;* McLeod, *Theory and Practice of Banking;* Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce;* Porter, *Progress of the Nation;* Marx, *Das Kapital* (contains much valuable fact extracted from Blue Books and other official publications); Walker, *Money;* the works of Ricardo; Bageliot, *Economic Studies;* Price, *History of Political Economy in England.*

Prisons and Prison Reform.—John Howard, *State of Prisons in England and Wales*, 4th ed., (1792); Pringle, *Jayl Fever* (*sic*) (1750). Among Acts of Parliament, Popham's Act to Abolish gaol fees, 16 Geo. III c. 43, substituting imprison-

ment for transportation; 19 Geo. III. c. 74, establishing Penitentiary Houses, are noteworthy, as also the proceedings of the Select Committee on Police and Convict Establishments, 1798, and the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Penitentiary Houses, 1811. *See* also Jeremy Bentham, *The Panopticon or the Inspection House* (Bentham's Works, ed. Bowring, vol. iv.); Eden, *Principles of Penal Law;* Heath on *Secondary Punishment*, in the App. to Parliamentary Reports, 1837; Lecky, vol. vi.; Neild, *State of Prisons*, 1812.

Scotland, 1742-1815.—*General:* Chambers, *Jacobite Rebellion* (1745-6) (with Bishop Forbes' MSS., 1834, now published by Scottish Historical Society in the *Lyon in Mourning*); Chevalier Johnston, *Memoirs of the Rebellion* (1745-6); Omond, *Lord Advocates* and *Arniston Memoirs* (Dundas family). *Economic Condition.—Lowlands: Histories* of Edinburgh, by Maitland (1753), and Arnot (1788); Cleland, *Annals of Glasgow* (1816); Kames, *Gentleman Farmer* (1788); Wight, *Present State of Agriculture* (1778-84); *Statistical Account* (1791-99); *County Reports to the Board of Agriculture*, 7 vols. (1797-1818): Robertson, *Rural Recollections* (1765-1829). *Highlands:* Buchanan, *Condition of the Hebrides* (1780); Walker, *Economic Condition* (1808); Selkirk, *Observations on the Highlands* (1805); Loch, *Sutherland Improvements* (1820); Sellar, *Sutherland Evictions in* 1812-1814 (1883); *Report of the Crofter Commission* (1884); *Histories* by Stewart (1825), Skene (1837), Browne (1849-53); Logan, *Scottish Gael* (1831). *Orkney and Shetland:* Tudor, *History* (1883), the latest and most complete. *Topography, etc.:* John McCulloch, *Highlands and Western Isles* (1824). *Travels: e.g.* Pococke (1760), Gray (1764: Tovey, *Gray and his Friends*, 1890), Pennant (1769-72), Johnson and Boswell (1773), Francis Douglas (1782), Newte (1791), Gilpin (1792), Heron (1793), Lettice (1794), St. Fond (Paris, 1794), Stoddart (1799), Hon. Mrs. Murray (1799-1802), Alexander Campbell (1802), Dorothy Wordsworth (1803), Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd (1803). *Social Life.—Memoirs* by Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk (1721-1805); Ramsay of Ochtertyre (1736-1814); Isaac Forsyth, bookseller in Elgin (1768-1859); Somerville of Jedburgh (1741-1814); William Forsyth, merchant in Cromarty (1722-99). *Reminiscences* of Philo-Scotus (1785-1821); Mrs. Grant of Laggan's *Memoirs and Correspondence* (1844) (a delightful picture of Highland Life); Donald Sage, *Memorabilia Domestica* (1889); Henry Cockburn (1779-1854), *Memorials, Journal, Circuit Journeys;* Mrs. Fletcher, *Autobiography* (1875). *Lives*—of Kames, by Lord Woodhouselee; Dr. Erskine, by Moncrieff; John Home, by Henry Mackenzie; Adam Smith, by Dugald Stewart; Jeffrey, by Cockburn; Burns, by Currie; *Henry Erskine*, by Fergusson; Lockhart's *Scott. Manners.*—Topham, *Letters from Edinburgh* (1776); David Allan, *Illustrations to the Gentle Shepherd* (1788); *Poems* of Ferguson and Burns; Jackson, *History of the Scottish Stage* (1793); Smollett, *Humphrey Clinker; Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk;* and among modern books—Daniel Wilson, *Memorials of Old Edinburgh* (1848); Robert Chambers, *Traditions of Old Edinburgh;* Gregor, *Folk Lore of the North-east of Scotland* (1881); Alexander, *Northern Rural Life* (1877).

Ireland, 1714-1800.—Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century;* Froude, *English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century;* Plowden, *History of Ireland; Two Centuries of Irish History*, ed. Bryce; Dunbar Ingram, *Two Chapters of Irish History;* Rt. Hon. J. T. Ball, *Historical Review of Legislative Systems in Ireland;* Swift, *Works;* Musgrave, *History of the Irish Rebellion;* Barry O'Brien, *Autobiography of Wolfe Tone;* J. T. Gilbert, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Charlemont; Correspondence* of Castlereagh, and of Cornwallis; *Lives* and *Speeches* of Grattan, Flood, Plunket, and Curran; Burke's *Works;* Barrington, *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation;* Madden, *History of the United Irishmen;* Moore, *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald; Autobiography* of Hamilton Rowan; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland;* Swift McNeill, *English Interference with Irish Industries*, and *How the Union was Carried; Correspondence between Pitt and Rutland;* Hutchinson, *Commercial Restraints on Ireland.*

CHAPTER XX.

ENGLAND'S STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE. 1802-1815.

ADDINGTON had succeeded Pitt as Prime Minister in 1801 and formed a cabinet of complete mediocrity which governed England till 1804. During the early portion of this administration England won great successes by land and by sea. The victories of Alexandria (March 21st), and Copenhagen (April 2nd, 1801), accelerated the negotiations for peace, while the accession of Alexander I. to the Russian throne led to the conclusion of a treaty between England and Russia in June of the same year. The French having failed to carry out an attempt to invade England agreed to come to terms, and in October the preliminaries of peace were signed. England yielded all her conquests except Ceylon, Trinidad, British Guiana, and Tobago. Before the preliminary treaty had been ratified, Bonaparte had by his intrigues established French influence in Holland, Switzerland, and Italy, thus justifying the fears of Grenville and others that the First Consul had no intention of relinquishing his aggressive schemes. The English nation was, however, weary of war. Pitt was confident that Bonaparte would recognise the advantages of peace, and it was felt that England, having made almost uncalled-for concessions, would convince Europe that her motives had been disinterested. On March 27th, 1802, the peace of Amiens was signed. Before, however, the year was over it became apparent that the peace would be but a truce. Bonaparte's aggressions never ceased; he annexed Elba and a large part of North Italy in the autumn of 1802, occupied Switzerland, and adopted a policy towards England which, while in its commercial aspect anticipating the famous Berlin Decrees (p. 518), was calculated to bring on a fresh European war. He demanded the suppression of the English journals

A. HASSALL. Political History.

Addington's Ministry.

The Peace of Amiens.

by which he had been attacked, he required the expulsion of all French emigrants and the removal from England of the Bourbon princes, and his agents endeavoured to stir up the Irish to rebellion.

Bonaparte was determined to secure Malta, which the English Government fortunately had not as yet transferred to the Knights of St. John. At the beginning of 1803 even Addington recognised that war was imminent and acted with some show of vigour. Lord Whitworth, our ambassador in Paris, was withdrawn, and on May 18th war was declared. A great struggle was now begun against the power of the First Consul. The French Revolution, in its earlier stages, had sympathised with the efforts of all nations desiring national liberty, and as the result of the revolutionary movement many small dynasties had been swept away, and Europe had experienced a sudden though salutary awakening. With the rise of Bonaparte the principles of the revolution were set aside and a period of aggression and conquest began which threatened to establish the French predominance in Europe. Against the danger of this domination Europe slowly rose, the struggles against Bonaparte became national, and "before the uprising of nations he gradually succumbed." Emmett's rebellion in 1803, the product of French agents working on the economic discontent of Ireland, increased Addington's difficulties. His Government was incompetent to deal with the critical state of affairs, the king's health was failing, a strong ministry was required, and at length on April 26th, 1804, Addington resigned, and Pitt, after endeavouring to secure the services of Fox and Grenville, was forced in consequence of the latter's hostility to form a Tory Ministry after the king's own heart, composed of such men as Harrowby, Eldon, Portland, Castlereagh, Hawkesbury, Melville, and Camden, while Canning, Huskisson, and Perceval occupied subordinate positions. The ministry, formed on a narrow Tory basis, was weak, and Pitt found himself, with a small majority in the Commons, compelled to prosecute the war against Bonaparte.

Reopening of the War. 1803.

Pitt's Second Ministry. 1804–1806.

In December, 1804, the First Consul became Emperor, and at once planned an invasion of England. Elaborate preparations for defence were made, the Additional Force Bill was

passed, the fleet was largely increased. Danger from France, however, by no means lessened Pitt's difficulties in Parliament. In December, 1804, Lord Harrowby, the Foreign Minister, was compelled by an accident to resign, and Addington, taking the title of Lord Sidmouth, joined the ministry. About the same time the Opposition attacked the able and successful administration of the navy by Lord Melville (p. 500). By a majority of one the House of Commons, on April 8th, 1805, censured the minister, who at once resigned, his example being in July followed by Sidmouth, between whom and Pitt relations had become very strained. Lord Melville was formally impeached, but the House of Lords (June 12th, 1806) acquitted him.

His Foreign Policy.

While Pitt was pursued by difficulties in Parliament, his foreign policy had at first met with success. Nelson and Calder had saved England from all danger of invasion, while the formation of the Third Coalition between England, Russia, and Austria in 1805 had shown Napoleon the necessity of attacking the Hapsburgs. On October 20th he surrounded and captured an Austrian army under Mack at Ulm, and, on December 2nd, "the Battle of the Three Emperors" took place at Austerlitz, the French winning a complete victory. Though successful on land, France had suffered a serious disaster at sea. On October 21st Nelson had won the battle of Trafalgar, losing his life early in the action. The sea passed under the command of the English, Napoleon's last fleet was destroyed, and England's trade was practically secure.

The Ministry of All the Talents. 1806.

On January 23rd, 1806, Pitt died, the news of Austerlitz and the dissolution of the coalition having seriously affected his already declining health. All hope of any successful opposition to France had for the time disappeared, and the ensuing two years saw the development of gigantic schemes of conquest and annexation on the part of Napoleon. The death of Pitt was followed by the break-up of the Cabinet, and the formation under Grenville of the Ministry of All the Talents, which included Fox as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Howick First Lord of the Admiralty, Sidmouth Privy Seal, Petty Chancellor of the Exchequer, Spencer and Windham Secretaries for the Home and War Departments, Fitzwilliam President of the Council, and Lord Moira Master-General of

the Ordnance. The slave trade was at once abolished, the Abolition Bill being passed on March 25th, 1807, and negotiations with the French were opened which demonstrated clearly the impossibility of trusting Napoleon. In September, 1806, Fox died, and was succeeded as Foreign Secretary by Howick. The ministry had realised the necessity of carrying on the war with vigour; in October, 1806, the battles of Jena and Auerstadt had overthrown Prussia, and on November 21st Napoleon had issued his famous Berlin Decrees. By these he declared that the whole of the British Isles were in a state of blockade, that France and all her dependent countries were forbidden to correspond or trade with them, that all English merchandise and all private property of Englishmen was confiscated, and all British subjects were prisoners of war. On January 7th, 1807, the Grenville Ministry replied by issuing the first of a series of Orders of Council forbidding vessels to trade between any ports in the possession of France or of her allies. A commercial war thus began which continued till 1815. "The French soldiers were turned into coast-guardsmen to shut out Great Britain from her markets; the British ships became revenue cutters to prohibit the trade of France." The Decrees and Orders eventually roused a bitter feeling in Prussia against Napoleon, and in the United States against England. Before, however, any further measures could be taken against France, and before the Bill for the abolition of the slave trade finally became law, the Grenville Ministry had fallen. The question of the Catholic claims had again been revived in the form of an Army and Navy Service Bill. In Ireland Roman Catholics, since 1793, had been allowed to hold any rank in the Irish army up to that of colonel, but after the Union they still continued unable to hold their rank when in England. In proposing to remove this anomaly ministers determined that the whole army and navy should be thrown open to Roman Catholics as well as to Nonconformists. The king, whose fears had been roused by Lord Sidmouth, and who relied on the Duke of Portland's offer to form a ministry, decided that he would not accept anything beyond the completion of the Act of 1793, and declared that he only meant to assimilate the law in England and Ireland. Though the ministry

The Berlin Decrees.

The Fall of the Ministry of All the Talents.

agreed to drop the Bill the king demanded a pledge that the subject of Catholic emancipation should not be brought forward again. The ministers naturally refused to give such a pledge, and on March 18th, 1807, were dismissed. George III. had again triumphed. In 1770 he had placed Lord North at the head of affairs, in 1784 he had secured the services of William Pitt, and now in 1807 he had finally discomfited the Whigs, who were not again in office till the time of the great Reform Bill. That George was supported by public opinion in his opposition to the Whig families is undoubted, that on each occasion his personal wishes were aided by underhand intrigues is equally true. On April 27th Parliament was dissolved, the constituencies supported the king, and the new ministry found itself in possession of a considerable majority.

The Triumph of George III.

The new anti-Catholic Administration was headed by the Duke of Portland, under whom served Eldon, the Chancellor, Perceval Chancellor of the Exchequer, Canning Foreign Secretary, Castlereagh War and Colonial Secretary, Hawkesbury — afterwards Lord Liverpool—Home Secretary. The ministry continued with vigour the warlike policy which Grenville had found it necessary to pursue during the last days of his ministry. A second Order in Council was issued in November, 1807, granting reprisals "against the goods, ships, and inhabitants of Tuscany, Naples, Dalmatia and the Ionian Islands," and by the third and fourth various plans of evasion were forbidden, such as the sale of a ship by a belligerent to a neutral. These retaliatory measures were rendered necessary by Napoleon's extension of the continental system to the Mediterranean and by his deliberate attempt to annihilate English trade.

The Portland Administration. 1807.

Having overthrown the Russians at Eylau on February 7th, he had on July 7th made with Alexander the Treaty of Tilsit, which was in itself a menance to the independence of Europe. To this arrangement between the Russian and French Emperors, Canning replied by seizing the Danish fleet on September 8th, while Russia attempted to force Sweden, England's ally, to join the continental system.

The Treaty of Tilsit, and the English Seizure of the Danish Fleet.

English forces had already defeated the French at the battle of Maida, had retaken Cape Colony from the Dutch, and had attacked Buenos Ayres, a Spanish colony (p. 535, *seqq*). But the importance of these small expeditions paled before the famous and successful opposition of England to Napoleon's attempt to subjugate the Spanish Peninsula. He had determined to make one of his relations King of Spain, to appropriate Portugal, and to close its ports against England.

England and Portugal.

In June, 1808, his brother Joseph was placed on the Spanish throne, Junot having already, in November, 1807, occupied Lisbon on the flight of the Portuguese royal family to Brazil. An English expedition landed in Portugal on August 1st, 1808, and Wellesley won the battle of Vimiera on August 21st, but on August 30th Sir Hew Dalrymple made the Convention of Cintra with the French. Great indignation was experienced in England at this convention, and Sir John Moore, to whom was given the command of the British army in Portugal, advanced to Salamanca. Hearing of the approach of Napoleon he retreated, and on January 16th, 1809, fought the battle of Corunna. His death, following the Convention of Cintra, for a time discouraged the English ministry, and it was not till Wellesley was given the command in April, 1809, that the Peninsular war may be said to have begun.

Divisions in Parliament in 1809. Perceval Prime Minister.

During the year 1809 the Ministry was assaulted by the Opposition and was not at one with itself. Attacks were made on the general purity of the Administration, and especially on the Duke of York, the Commander-in-Chief, on Castlereagh, and on Perceval. The Walcheren expedition, which was itself right in principle, proved a disastrous failure (p. 537). One result of this disaster was a duel between Castlereagh and Canning on September 9th, followed by the resignation of both, and the reconstruction of the Ministry. In October Perceval became Prime Minister, Lord Wellesley, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Lord Liverpool took the War Office, with Lord Palmerston as Under Secretary. During these months of continual agitation at home, Arthur Wellesley was winning victories in Portugal. He had forced the French armies to retire and had marched towards Madrid. In July he had

The Peninsular War.

won the battle of Talavera, and had it not been for the weak war administration in England he might have gained some conspicuous advantages. As it was he devoted himself to the defence of Portugal and fortified the lines of Torres Vedras. Massena having failed to dislodge him, was beaten off at the battle of Busaco on September 29th, 1810. The year 1811 found him (after Talavera he had been raised to the peerage as Viscount Wellington) still acting on the defensive. He fought the battles of Fuentes d'Onoro and Albuera in May, while the French, having completed the conquest of the east of Spain, were threatening to make a vigorous attack on Portugal.

England and Europe.

But events in central and north-eastern Europe came to the aid of the English. Though the Austrian opposition to Napoleon in 1809 had failed, and the peace of Vienna (Oct. 14th, 1809) had cut short the Austrian territories, it had become evident that a national opposition to the French was growing. The power of the people all over Europe was gradually but surely coming into collision with the despotic tendencies of the French Emperor. At the close of 1811, too, the relations between Napoleon and Alexander had become strained, and both monarchs prepared for war. In 1812 the famous Moscow expedition took place, with the result that the north of Germany rose. Prussia and Russia formed an alliance which was later joined by Austria, and the war of Liberation began. In contributing to the fall of Napoleon the operations of Wellington in Portugal played a considerable part. In November, 1810, George III.'s illness had necessitated the appointment of the Prince of Wales as Regent, and in 1811 a Regency Bill was passed restricting the power of the prince.

The Liverpool Ministry. 1812.

The Perceval Ministry was continued, but in February, 1812, Wellesley retired from office, and in May Perceval was assassinated by a man named Bellingham. Lord Liverpool became Prime Minister, with Castlereagh as Foreign Secretary, the other ministers remaining in office. Wellington was heartily supported, and a war with America caused by the Orders in Council, ended after a series of struggles on land and on sea—in which success and failure were pretty evenly balanced—in the Convention of Ghent, signed on December 24th, 1814.

In 1812, Wellington, having taken Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajos, won Salamanca and entered Madrid on August 12th. Forced to retreat to Portugal by the overwhelming French forces, he again advanced in 1813, won the battle of Vittoria on June 21st, and the battle of the Pyrenées, Soult in the following January evacuating Bayonne. In October Napoleon, having lost the battle of Leipzig, had fallen back across the Rhine. The allies entered France, and in January, 1814, Wellington forced the passage of the Bidassoa, defeated Soult at Orthez in February, and at Toulouse in April. After a brilliant campaign against the Russians, Austrians, and Prussians, Napoleon was forced to abdicate, and early in April the war came to a conclusion. Louis XVIII. was restored, and at the Congress of Vienna Europe was reconstructed. During the Congress Napoleon escaped from Elba in March, 1815, and it was not till June 18th that the battle of Waterloo overthrew his hopes and led to the second restoration of Louis XVIII. on terms arranged under the influence of England. In the settlement at Vienna of the various problems which had arisen during the struggle against Napoleon, Lord Castlereagh and the Duke of Wellington exercised considerable influence. England secured Malta, the Ionian Islands, Heligoland, the Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, Ceylon, Trinidad, and Tobago. The Austrian Netherlands and Holland were united under the Prince of Orange, Norway and Sweden were placed under one king, Russia received a large share of Poland, while Prussia was given a portion of Saxony, Austria secured Venice and its possessions, and the Republic of Genoa was handed over to the King of Sardinia. After much negotiation the English representatives succeeded in inducing France, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands to abolish the slave trade.

Wellington's Victories. 1812-1813.

Final Overthrow of Napoleon and Settlement of Europe.

The completion of the settlement of Europe, though in many ways unsatisfactory, came as a great relief to England. The nation had been raised to a position of the highest importance in Europe, but required a period of peace in order that full attention might be devoted to the satisfactory solution of the many pressing problems which had arisen during the war.

IMMEDIATELY after the peace of Amiens, England, eager to disarm, had reduced her army almost to vanishing point, and consequently on the resumption of hostilities with France she found herself in a position of the greatest danger. To repel Napoleon's threatened invasion of her soil, she could only place 40,000 regulars in the field. By dint of incredible exertions, the ministers in the course of a few months succeeded in raising an army, formidable at least in point of numbers. The returns for 1804 show that in Great Britain there were serving 75,000 regular infantry, 12,000 regular cavalry, 80,000 militia, and 343,000 yeomanry and volunteers. These last were enrolled for local, not for general purposes of defence; and it was asserted that they absorbed so large a number of the classes who should have served in the regular army or in the militia, that the difficulties of recruiting for these, the first and second lines of defence, were greatly increased. The wits of the day indeed said that the Ministry had "not only provided an army, but rendered it impossible that an army should be provided." Whether the existence of the volunteers did or did not diminish the numbers of the recruits for the line and the militia, it is certain that the effort of keeping the army up to its full strength during the war was enormous, though after 1808 only about 22,000 men were annually required to make good the deficiency caused by death, desertion and discharge. As if in anticipation of the system that now connects the militia with the regular army, Pitt affiliated to each line regiment a militia corps, which regularly supplied their linked battalions with "food for powder," and thus to a large extent facilitated recruiting. During the twelve years between 1803 and 1814, out of some 270,000 men who joined the army, no less than 113,000 were volunteers from the ranks of the militia. But this was not enough to make good the annual waste: the army was unpopular chiefly because men had to enlist for unlimited service—or in other words to become soldiers for the rest of their lives. Although Government actually sanctioned the enlistment of boys under sixteen, to the extent of 10 per

G. LE M. GRETTON. The Army.

Garrison of the United Kingdom in 1804.

Recruiting.

cent. of the strength of the regiments, and although, according to Dupin, "the hulks were drained and the prisons emptied more than once to supply the want of soldiers," recruits became so hard to obtain that in 1807 each man cost in bounty and levy money nearly £40. In that year a system of limited engagement (short service) was introduced; men undertook to serve from seven to twelve years with the colours, with power to renew their engagement from time to time, and thus ultimately to earn a pension for their old age. The immediate effect of this concession to public opinion was to produce so many more recruits for the regular army that their market price fell from £40 to £30.

Until the middle of the last century the ranks of the army were almost exclusively filled by Englishmen and Lowland Scots. During the seven years' war Chatham threw open the career of arms to the Highlanders, who eagerly embraced it; but it was not until 1800 that Irishmen were "admitted into the army without forfeiting their creed or nationality."* Then they joyfully swarmed into the army, literally by tens of thousands: and during the first fourteen years of the nineteenth century Ireland sent forth 100,000 of her sons to fight in the battles of the United Kingdom.

Foreigners in our Service.

In all our eighteenth century wars England had largely recruited her forces with foreigners, of whom we formed battalions, which became an integral part of our army. During the Napoleonic war we enrolled a large quantity of continentals; in 1809 there were 37,000 in our service; in 1812 the number had risen to 45,000; and in 1813, out of some 261,000 regulars in our service, about 54,000, or more than 20 per cent., were of foreign nationality. Many of these were Germans, thoroughly reliable troops; there were also corps of French Royalists, Swiss, Greeks, Maltese, Sicilians, Corsicans and Calabrians. Some of these battalions were composed of good materials, but others were most undesirable accessions to the British army, and were a source of danger rather than of strength to the generals under whom they served.†

* Major-Gen. Sir W. F. Butler, "Plea for the Peasant" [in his "Far Out"], p. 299.

† See the account of the mutiny at Malta in Bunbury, "Passages in the Great War with France," p. 310.

Conscription for the Militia.

Service in the militia is by the law of England compulsory on every adult male; and although the general practice has been to trust to volunteers for maintaining our home service army up at proper strength, there have been times when its ranks have been filled by conscripts and not by volunteers. In the Seven Years' War Chatham kept the militia up to their strength by means of the ballot; and during our great war with France the ballot was rigorously enforced from 1792 to 1811: in other words, the militia was raised by conscription whenever the supply of voluntary recruits became inadequate. In 1808, with the intention of supplementing the regular militia, who were liable to do duty in any part of the United Kingdom, a new force, termed "local militia," was raised by ballot, not for general service, but for the defence of their own districts only. Curiously enough, a well-to-do man who was drawn by ballot to serve in the local militia was not allowed to buy a substitute, though in the regular militia this privilege was allowed to the monied classes. To the abuses which gathered round this system of purchasing substitutes is due the suspension of the ballot. The national feeling revolted at such incidents as were recorded in the Annual Register of 1810, when at Plymouth a substitute was paid £60 for his services; when another was hired on condition of receiving four shillings a day during the continuance of the war, and a third sold himself by weight for 7s. 3d. per pound! After 1811 the militia was recruited by free men obtained by "beat of drum," and no longer by conscripts forced to serve against their will.

Duties of the Militia.

During the whole of the great war the militia rendered invaluable service to the country. Not only did the "Constitutional Force" supply nearly half the recruits for the army; but it also relieved large numbers of line regiments from garrison duty in the United Kingdom and thus set them free for foreign service. After an embodiment of several years the militia battalions were in no way inferior to those of the line; and in 1814 a large brigade, exclusively composed of militia, was sent to reinforce Wellington in France, but it arrived too late to take part in the concluding operations of the war.

Distribution of the Army.

During the Napoleonic wars England maintained an immense army scattered all over the face of the globe. Thus, in 1809, six years before the struggle with France ended, nearly 700,000 soldiers were serving under the British flag. As garrison of the United Kingdom, there were in round numbers 108,000 regular cavalry and infantry, and 65,000 regular militia; 200,000 local militia, and 190,000 volunteers. Abroad were 110,000 more regular troops, distributed as follows. In the Mediterranean were 22,000; and in the West Indies nearly as many. In India, including the East India Company's 4,000 Europeans, 24,000 white men gave solidity to the native troops in our employ. In North America there were 8,000 redcoats; 4,000 garrisoned Ceylon; 1,300 fighting men were absorbed in guarding convicts in New South Wales. In Madeira 900 were stationed; and the Cape of Good Hope, the half way house to India, required the protection of nearly 6,000 bayonets. Detachments of troops at sea, the regiment of artillery and the corps of engineers together represented about 18,000 more; while fighting against the French in Portugal was a little army of 22,000 strong.

Neglect of Troops by Government.

This generation, accustomed to the wise care bestowed upon the wants and comforts of the private soldier, can scarcely credit the neglect with which the British Government treated their troops in the Peninsula. Though Wellington did his best for the men under his command, even his remarkable powers of organisation could not atone for the apathy with which the ministry regarded the war in Spain. Reinforcements of men the War Office did indeed send him; but small supplies of stores and little money ever reached him, though millions were annually shipped from England to the Continent to bribe the powers to fight their own battles against Napoleon. More than once his men did not receive their pay for six months together; they marched barefooted and in rags; during four campaigns they were unprovided with tents. In health they were often short of food; in sickness they were badly tended, for the hospitals were so ill-equipped, the doctors so few in number that two hundred dying men were left with one solitary hospital mate to dress their wounds and minister to their wants. Against

this state of things Wellington struggled hard, and as far as the range of his personal influence extended, with success. But officers, even under the Duke's own eyes, were callous to the sufferings of the rank and file, and must often have escaped scot-free, though condign punishment occasionally overtook them. Thus Wellington one evening at dinner was told that at a British post, several miles distant, there were a considerable number of sick soldiers lying in the open, without shelter and exposed to the weather. That night the Duke rode to the village, inspected the sick, and then roused the officers from the comfortable houses in which they had taken up their quarters. To his inquiry why the sick were thus left neglected, the commanding officer coolly replied that there was no accommodation for them in the place! The Duke himself went round to all the houses occupied by these unworthy officers, and settled the numbers of the sick who were to be billeted in each dwelling; he then gave specific orders that the invalids were to be at once moved into the houses, and to remain where he had placed them. So sulkily were these orders received that Wellington next night paid a surprise visit to the village; and found that the invalids had been again turned out into the streets! The sick were reinstated; the offending officers were placed under arrest, and marched to headquarters, where they were promptly tried and cashiered for disobedience to orders.

Much might have been done by the regimental officers to mitigate the hardships of the rank and file, by looking after them and protecting them against the consequences of the carelessness ingrained in the British soldier; but except in the Guards and in Craufurd's Light Division, and in a few of the best line regiments, it was not the fashion for the commissioned ranks to interest themselves about the men under their immediate command. In fact it is hardly too much to say that one of Wellington's greatest difficulties was to induce his officers to do their duty towards the men. Thus in September, 1812, in a general order, Wellington "entreats" all officers to obey the important orders which he had recently issued respecting the daily inspection of the men's ammunition. A few weeks later, in a circular letter, he says that in the retreat from Burgos the officers had from

and by Regimental Officers.

the first lost all command over their men, hence excesses, outrages and inexcusable losses, of which the true cause was the habitual neglect of duty by regimental officers. Yet badly as they often were treated, the men never failed to fight well. They possessed a stern courage, and a priceless inability to recognise when they were beaten; but if their soldierly virtues were magnificent, their shortcomings during the first years of the war were grievous. They were drunken, marauding, and undisciplined, and when under the influence of great excitement liable to fits of savage cruelty which rendered them even more dangerous to friends than foes.

But in justice to the men it must be said that many of their superiors set them a very bad example, not only in Spain, but in all parts of the world. The reports of the courts-martial show how low a standard at this time prevailed among many of our regimental officers. Some were cashiered for drunkenness on guard, on parade, or on duty; others for defaulting with Government money. Some, again, were dismissed the service for striking their superior officers; a colonel was cashiered for beating a sergeant in the public streets; and a captain for drinking in a barrack room with his men, and abetting them in the commission of an act of outrageous cruelty upon a woman. It must also be remembered that in the Peninsula many of the soldiers were deprived of all the restraining influences of religion. There were a few Protestant chaplains; but not one single priest was attached to the army to minister to the spiritual wants of the Roman Catholics who formed fully half the strength of Wellington's expedition.

Punishments.

In every army discipline must be stern and punishment severe, but at the beginning of the nineteenth century severity in the English service had degenerated into mere brutality. Except in the comparatively rare cases where death was awarded, the stock punishment for every description of military offence, great or small, was flogging, inflicted with a degree of reckless cruelty which this generation can hardly comprehend. Courts-martial used to sentence soldiers to 1,500 lashes, until, in 1807, the commander-in-chief ordered that for the future 1,000 lashes should be the greatest number inflicted. In some battalions flogging was so prevalent that it was

estimated that half the men had been tied up to the "triangles" for punishment. In one unfortunate regiment quartered in India the average number of lashes inflicted monthly was 17,000. On some occasions the drummers, who acted as flagellators, were ordered to count five slowly between each stroke, in order that the torture might be prolonged; and surgeons stood by the triangles, to revive the miserable wretches when they fainted under the cat, and thus render it possible for them to receive the full number of lashes to which they had been sentenced. Terrible as was the flogging in the regular army, it is said to have been even worse in the militia, where the officers, less experienced in the management of men, awarded it upon the slightest occasion. Gradually public opinion demanded some mitigation of these horrors, and in 1812 a fresh order from the Horse Guards limited the powers of regimental courts-martial to 300 lashes; but even before the promulgation of this order there had been a movement for reform among the more enlightened regimental officers themselves. Among the troops quartered in the Mediterranean a few bold and humane commanding officers had ventured to depart from precedent and from the strict letter of the regulations; instead of flogging men for slight military offences, they awarded solitary confinement with hard labour (the modern "cells"), with very satisfactory results. But these new ideas gained ground but slowly, and all through the great war, order in the British Army was principally maintained by the lash, though whenever an outbreak of marauding took place Wellington ruthlessly hanged the culprits by scores upon the trees along the roads. It is not surprising, therefore, that men recruited from the lowest classes, contaminated by compulsory association with criminals and habitually kept under an iron discipline, on occasions such as the final storming of Badajos should have cast restraint to the winds and committed most horrible excesses.

Tactics.

When the French Revolution plunged Europe into universal war, the system of tactics prevalent throughout the monarchical armies of the Continent was that of Frederick the Great (p. 18). The great Prussian's linear movements were, however, based

on the assumption that the soldiers who executed them were thoroughly drilled and disciplined, and were therefore inapplicable to the young levies of the French revolutionary armies, whose officers accordingly reverted to a modification of the attack in column, which Frederick had discarded for the attack in line. Instead, however, of moving in the huge unwieldy masses which had found favour in the middle of the century, the French recruits were formed into small handy columns, 400 to 500 strong, which advanced against the enemy preceded by a swarm of skirmishers, whose function it was to cover the movements of the column by a rapid and well-directed musketry fire.

Deterioration of the French Column.

These shallow columns moved with the interval between them necessary to enable them to deploy, *i.e.* to change their formation from column to line. Thus, if themselves attacked, they could rapidly deploy, and from a continuous three-deep line pour their volleys into the advancing foe; if the enemy stood on the defensive, they remained in column and charged him with the bayonet. This formation has been aptly described as bearing to Frederick's line the resemblance which a flexible chain bears to a bar of iron; it required comparatively little steadiness in drill, and left much to the remarkable courage, intelligence, and self-control of the individual soldiers who served under the Republican flag; and therefore it answered admirably as long as the high standard of the French rank and file was maintained. But when Napoleon assumed the purple, one of his bids for popularity was to substitute conscription for the universal military service enforced by the Republic. The well-to-do classes, now allowed to purchase substitutes from among the uneducated masses, availed themselves of this privilege in numbers which every year increased; and thus the intellectual element was gradually eliminated from the ranks of the Imperial army. As time went on, the Republican veterans began to die off; and to meet the ceaseless and terrible drain which campaigns in every part of Europe made upon the nation, half-grown lads were sent into the field before their nerves could stand the strain to which their sturdy predecessors were accustomed. The quality of the regimental officers also deteriorated, for even originally there were comparatively few men competent to command battalions

fighting in small and isolated columns; and as they were promoted or killed off, their successors often proved unable to follow in their footsteps. From these varied causes it was soon found that the Imperial armies could not fight in the shallow formations of the Republic; and, therefore, to give the recruits confidence, and to bring the battalion officers more directly under the eyes of the generals, the columns gradually were made more massive, and consequently more unwieldy. The climax was reached at Waterloo, where the columns launched against the British line were twenty-four ranks deep.

Napoleon's artillery tactics consisted in massing his guns and concentrating their fire upon the particular part of the enemy's position which he proposed to attack, so as to breach the line and demoralise and crush its defenders by his projectiles before his columns assailed them with the bayonet. In cavalry work, his advance guard of light horse moved forty, fifty, or even a hundred miles in front of his main body, whose front and flanks they screened with a chain of moving outposts along every road; thus they obtained information about the enemy, and prevented his reconnoitring parties from approaching the main body of their own army. Wellington could never emulate Napoleon's daring employment of his horsemen, for the niggardly policy of the British government kept him ill supplied both with cavalry and with artillery. In the Peninsula he usually depended on his staff officers for information about the enemy. They hung on the flanks of the French columns, just out of gunshot, and coolly took notes on all they saw, confident that the great speed of the blood horses which they rode would always secure them against capture. The Duke never appears to have appreciated the effect of the concentrated fire of a great mass of artillery; but the essential difference between his tactics and those of Napoleon was in the handling of infantry. The Emperor always attacked in column, while the Duke invariably attacked in line, and used the column solely as a manœuvring and not as a fighting formation. Whether in attack or defence, British foot soldiers in a thin two-deep line could always be trusted to fight against hostile infantry in any formation; and their steadiness, both on the defensive and in a counter-

The English Line.

attack, is well described by Marshal Bugeaud, a distinguished French officer, in the following words:—

"The English generally occupied well chosen defensive positions, having a certain command, and they showed only a portion of their force. The usual artillery action first took place. Soon, in great haste, without studying the position, without taking time to examine if there were means to make a flank attack, we marched straight on, taking the bull by the horns. About 1,000 yards from the English line the men became excited, spoke to one another, and hurried their march; the column began to be a little confused.

"The English remained quite silent, with ordered arms, and from their steadiness appeared to be a long red wall. This steadiness invariably produced an effect on the young soldiers.

"Very soon we got nearer, shouting 'Vive l'Empereur, en avant! à la bayonette!' Shakos were raised on the muzzles of the muskets; the column began to double, the ranks got into confusion, the agitation produced a tumult; shots were fired as we advanced.

"The English line remained still, silent and immovable, with ordered arms, even when we were only 300 paces distant, and it appeared to ignore the storm about to break.

"The contrast was striking; in our inmost thoughts, each felt that the enemy was a long time in firing, and that this fire, reserved for so long, would be very unpleasant when it did come. Our ardour cooled. The moral power of steadiness, which nothing shakes (even if it be only in appearance), over disorder which stupefies itself with noise, overcame our minds. At this moment of intense excitement, the English wall shouldered arms, an indescribable feeling rooted many of our men to the ground, they began to fire. The enemy's steady concentrated volleys swept our ranks; decimated we turned round seeking to recover our equilibrium; then three deafening cheers broke the silence of our opponents, at the third they were on us, pushing our disorganised flight. But to our great surprise, they did not push their advantage beyond a hundred yards, retiring calmly to their lines to await a second attack."

Musketry.

In the opinion of General Marbot, who served with distinction on the staff of Massena and of Lannes in Spain, one of the principal causes of the French defeats in the Peninsula was the steady shooting of the British infantry. He describes them as the best shots in Europe, the only troops who were properly taught the use of their fire-arms. Yet, even allowing for the inferiority of the weapon then in use, the standard of marksmanship does not seem to have been high: in 1804 it was said of a crack corps, "that they were such excellent shots that they were sure to hit the target at 150 yards!" The riflemen seem to have been allowed sixty rounds of ball cartridge for their

yearly instruction in shooting; the light infantry had ten less; and the line and militia were considered adequately trained for battle when they had fired thirty rounds a year! From a quarter-master in the Rifle Brigade we learn that he established a great reputation for shooting as a recruit; out of the first ten rounds he fired, all hit the target, and two reached the bullseye! The targets were six feet high by two feet wide, the bullseye was eight inches round, the distance only fifty yards; but the performance was considered so good that it won him much praise, and a tip of sixpence from his captain!*

Dress.

During the Peninsular War there were considerable changes in uniform. Tight-fitting coatees with miniature tails, tight trousers, and short gaiters like the modern spat came into fashion, and displaced the loose coat, breeches and long buttoned gaiters, more practical though less showy, which had been so long the uniform of the British line. On active service the officers gradually substituted cloth caps for the regulation cocked hats, which were so huge that the ends almost touched the shoulders. But if they retrenched in the size of their hats, they revenged themselves by wearing coats so long that the skirts almost swept the ground. Their sashes were worn round the waist, not over the left shoulder, as in the present day; and their hair was allowed to attain a length shocking to the ideas of a generation who have been taught by the commander-in-chief that "in the field no man's hair should be half an inch in length." One glorious innovation there was: in 1808 pigtails were finally done away with, to the intense joy of the soldiers throughout the army. One regiment, already embarked for foreign service when the welcome order came, gave three cheers as they flung the pigtails into Portsmouth harbour; another buried them with mock solemnity; while a third made a bonfire of these relics of a barbarous and senseless fashion.

Weight carried by the Men.

If, when permission was given to discard pigtails, some improvement had been made in the distribution of the burden carried by the troops in marching order, much misery and many lives would have been saved on active service. The load

* Surtees, "Twenty-five Years in the Rifle Brigade," p. 42.

in itself, "enough to impede the free motions of a donkey," was so awkwardly placed that the body was cramped, the head forced forward, the action of the heart impeded; in fact, to use the expression of an indignant private, "the man was half beaten before he came to the scratch." *

So well known are Wellington's victories that it is unnecessary to touch upon them here: indeed, so much has the attention of Englishmen been directed to our splendid achievements in the Peninsula and the Waterloo campaigns, that many of our minor expeditions had been almost forgotten.

Minor Expeditions. 1802-1815.

Yet in the history of many of these enterprises there is much that is instructive, though often mortifying to our national pride. It is true that our attacks upon the enemies' colonies were usually successful, and added Cape Colony and Mauritius, Guiana and St. Lucia to the British Empire. It is also true that Canada was successfully defended against the United States during the war of 1812–14, though not without reverses to our arms. But in Europe, those of our campaigns which were not conducted by Wellington, when not absolutely disastrous, were at any rate singularly barren of result. Even before Trafalgar the Navy was strong enough to safely convoy fleets of transports containing British soldiers to any point on the shores of the Mediterranean or the North Sea; yet at high water mark the limits of our ascendancy were reached. Against the dull stupidity of the Government in military matters the army could not contend. The ministry and their military advisers seemed alike incapable of planning a successful land operation in Europe, of explaining to their generals the objects of the expedition upon which they were despatched, and of providing for the needs of the expeditionary force. Often for months together the officers commanding abroad were left without instructions

* Rifleman Harris, a regimental shoemaker in the Rifle Brigade, in his "Recollections" (ed. Curling, p. 26), thus describes the burden laid upon the backs of the men in the Peninsula. "Besides my well-filled kit, there was the great coat rolled on the top, my blanket and camp kettle, my haversack stuffed full of leather for repairing the men's shoes, together with a hammer and other tools, ship's biscuits and beef for three days, my canteen filled with water, my hatchet and rifle, and 80 rounds of cartridge in my pouch." Only the rifle regiments were armed with rifles: the rest of the army carried the smooth-bore musket, popularly known as Brown Bess.

from the War Office, and when despatches did arrive, they were frequently so worded as to be virtually unintelligible.

In 1805 England sent an expedition of 7,000 men to Naples, nominally to co-operate with the Neapolitans and their Russian allies in expelling the French from Italy; but really with secret orders to occupy Sicily and prevent its falling into the hands of Napoleon. The combined army of English, Russians and Neapolitans were placed under the command of Lacy, an Irishman of high rank in the service of the Czar, a curious specimen of the generals whom the Continental powers frequently pitted against Napoleon and his young and vigorous marshals. This veteran of nearly eighty winters used to astonish the members of the councils of war which were held at Naples by calmly producing and donning a night-cap, in which he used peacefully to sleep while his subordinates transacted the business before them. But even in his extreme old age Lacy retained the fire of his race, for, to use his own expression, "he was always for fighting."* But fighting there was none in this campaign. Relieved from all anxiety in their rear by the news of the victory of Austerlitz, the French troops in the north of Italy advanced against the allies in overwhelming numbers. The Russians embarked their troops for the Ionian Isles, the English for Sicily, where with the permission of its sovereign, the King of Naples, we maintained until 1813 a large garrison, chiefly quartered along the Straits of Messina. It is perhaps as well that there was no powder burned in Southern Italy in 1805, for the British general had made the discovery, on his way from England, that the supply of ammunition and flints at Malta, his base of operations, was dangerously low. Certainly in 1805 expeditions to foreign countries were curiously ill-supplied, for if our own troops were short of ammunition, the Russians were left unprovided with money, and when they came to embark at Naples, it was found that they had no provisions for their voyage to Corfu, no money, and no credit with the local merchants. Bunbury says, "they could not have escaped had not the English general run the risk of supplying them with biscuit, and lending them £25,000."

To Naples and Sicily, 1805.

* Bunbury's "Passages in the Great War with France," p. 218.

During the next year occurred the one redeeming episode in our proceedings in the Mediterranean, the victory of Maida. General Stuart, the British commander, decided to make a sudden raid upon the French, who in large numbers occupied the province of Calabria, the toe of Italy. With a secrecy and a promptitude not too common in our military history, about 6,000 men were embarked at Messina and landed in the Gulf of St. Eufemia, near the village of Maida, from which the battle takes its name. Next day (2nd July) Stuart, after leaving a detachment to protect his retreat, advanced against the French, whom he encountered on the plain of Maida, under the command of their well-known general, Reynier. His corps outnumbered Stuart's by about 1,000, and possessed 300 cavalry, an arm with which the British force was totally unprovided, so that the odds were distinctly in favour of the French.

Both sides advanced to the attack, and a fierce fight took place, in which the deadly volleys of the British infantry and the alacrity with which they advanced to cross bayonets with Napoleon's veterans, were alike surprising to the French. At the crisis of the battle, Reynier's right was turned; and the French wavered and broke before the British, whose prowess on land they had so long affected to despise. Owing to his want of cavalry Stuart was unable to pursue the French, so his troops returned to the beach, where later in the day occurred an incident amusing in itself and showing how strongly the sense of discipline was already developed among our men. A brigade was bathing in the sea when a staff officer galloped in from the front to give warning that the French cavalry were coming down upon them. In a moment the bathers, "rushing out of the sea, throwing their belts over their shoulders, grasped their muskets, and drew up in line without attempting to assume an article of clothing! The alarm was utterly groundless; a great dust and an imperfect view of a herd of scampering buffaloes" had deceived the eyes of the young staff officer.

Our success was not vigorously followed up; in a few days the last redcoat had returned to Sicily, and the material results of the victory were small. But the moral effect of this engagement was immense, for it restored the waning confidence of England in the valour of her soldiery, and roused

the aggressive spirit which found its ultimate expression in Wellington's expedition to the Peninsula.

As a base of operations Sicily seems to have been of singularly little use to us, for though several expeditions sailed from her ports, none had any real influence upon the struggle with Napoleon. The garrison did indeed dispossess the French troops who occupied the Ionian Isles; but when they attacked the Turks in Egypt, they were heavily repulsed, while their demonstrations against the French army in the South of Italy were feeble in the extreme. Our troops in Sicily provided the force with which Lord William Bentinck in 1813 landed on the north-east coast of Spain, hoping to create a diversion in favour of Wellington by attacking the French in Catalonia—a well intentioned, but indifferently executed project. Next year Bentinck won easy laurels at the head of an Anglo-Italian expedition by wresting Genoa from the feeble French force which garrisoned it.

The Walcheren Expedition.

But if our operations in the Mediterranean were futile, at any rate they were not gigantic failures such as the Walcheren expedition, in which numbers of men were sent to rot, inactive, in the fever-stricken islands of the Scheldt. The ever increasing strength and importance of Antwerp as a French naval station had long caused uneasiness in England; and in 1809 a noble armament was despatched to the Scheldt with instructions to destroy the arsenals and dockyards of Antwerp and of Flushing. In July thirty-seven ships of the line, twenty-three frigates, thirty-three sloops, eighty-two gunboats, and transports containing 39,000 troops sailed for the Batavian Archipelago; and from all the French accounts it seems clear that had an immediate attack been made on Antwerp, the city must have surrendered, so reduced at that moment were the numbers of its garrison. Unhappily, Court favour had conferred the command of the army upon Lord Chatham, a respectable nonentity, "who neither inherited the energy of his father nor shared the capacity of his brother, William Pitt." From stupidity or obstinacy, he wholly misinterpreted his orders; and instead of seizing Antwerp with a rush, he played into the hands of the French by wasting invaluable time in laying siege to Flushing. So slow was he in his movements that six days after this fortress had fallen the

army had only advanced thirty miles towards their goal. During these delays the French had made Antwerp virtually impregnable; and the Walcheren fever had fastened on our army. The entries in an official diary of the campaign show how rapidly this disease, a virulent form of fever and ague, spread among the troops. On August 22nd, "sickness began to show itself," and "greatly increased during the next twenty-four hours." On the 25th 3,000 men were down; next day "it continued to an alarming degree"; on the 27th "it increases every hour"; and on the 28th it reached "alarming proportions, nearly 4,000 men on the sick list."

At the end of August Chatham summoned a council of war to consider the position of affairs; and it was decided to forego all projects against Antwerp, to leave a garrison of 15,000 men in the island of Walcheren, and to send the remainder of the army back to England immediately. Before this resolution could be fully carried into effect, the fever had claimed many more victims. On the 8th September the sick of the whole army, including those already sent back to England, amounted to 10,948; while two days later, in the island of Walcheren alone, 7,300 wretched men were ill, "shaking to such an extent they could hardly walk." James, the naval historian, asserts that early in 1810 there were more than 11,000 men in England, still sick from the fever.

An intelligent private relates that three weeks after his battalion landed in Walcheren there were only three or four men of his company left on their legs; the rest, "reduced in strength to infants, lay groaning in rows in a barn among the heaps of lumpy black bread which they were unable to eat." The surgeons were puzzled and overworked; two of them had to attend five hundred patients until they were reinforced by doctors from the fleet, which was entirely free from the disease. As soon as possible the sick were huddled together on crowded transports and sent home, dosed on the voyage with an infusion of bark which was carried about the ship in pails and given to the men in tumblers. In the hospitals in England the Walcheren men died rapidly; one who was fortunate enough to recover was in a ward containing eleven beds, "and from my bed in the corner where I lay I saw this ward refilled ten times, the former patients being all carried out to the grave." It was found impossible to maintain

a garrison in this fever-stricken island; and before Christmas the troops finally evacuated it. In this miserable campaign 7,000 men were lost, killed by the climate, not by the enemy, and nearly half the survivors returned to England with constitutions ruined for life.

Moore's Retreat through Spain.

The year 1809 was certainly a chequered and memorable one for the army; in the autumn the Walcheren disaster, in the summer Wellington's victory at Talavera, in January Moore's retreat through Spain, and his brilliant action at Corunna. In this celebrated retreat the troops suffered terribly from cold, hunger and fatigue; discipline often disappeared, but valour never; and the soldiers whom resolute commanders like Craufurd flogged for insubordination while the enemy was almost within sight of the triangles, never failed to do their duty on the battle field, though their backs were still bleeding from the effects of the lash.

Soldiers' Families on Active Service.

A curious feature in the British armies of this period was the large number of soldiers' wives and families who followed the troops on foreign service. In Moore's campaign numbers fell into the hands of the French; Marbot indeed asserts that in one granary no less "than 1,000 or 1,200 English women and children, nearly all beautiful," were found, too exhausted to keep up with the army, and therefore abandoned to the tender mercies of the enemy. Others succeeded in reaching the coast, and rejoined their friends after strange adventures, well described in the book from which quotations have already been made, the "Recollections of Rifleman Harris."

Craufurd's Expedition to Chili.

In the commissioned ranks also, men were wont to take their wives and children on active service. When in 1806 Craufurd was appointed to the command of a small division intended to attack the Spaniards at Chili, he had great difficulty in inducing his married officers to leave their families behind them in England. The details of this expedition show the extraordinary slowness with which our oversea campaigns were conducted at the beginning of the century, when England seemed to hold time as cheaply as she did the health of her fighting men. Although the 5,000 troops under Craufurd's command had been embarked at the end of July,

it was not until the middle of November that they were ordered to sail from Falmouth. Their first port was St. Jago, one of the Cape de Verde islands, where they spent four weeks waiting for orders; then the word was given to steer for Cape Colony, where they arrived in the middle of March, 1807. With a truly national ignorance of geography, the fleet dropped anchor in False Bay, "from whence, on discovering that a place where neither bread nor water could be procured was not immediately adapted for refitting an expedition," they proceeded to Cape Town itself. Here Craufurd received orders to hasten, not to Chili, but to the River Plate, on the eastern coast of South America; and by the middle of June, after nearly eleven months at sea, the weary troops joyfully landed near Monte Video. Here they found a considerable force, sent from England to rescue 1,400 British soldiers from the Spanish colonists, into whose hands they had fallen in 1806, through the rash and unauthorised proceedings of Admiral Sir Home Popham. Early in that year Popham, who had convoyed Baird's successful expedition to Cape Colony, became infatuated with the idea of organising the conquest of the Spanish settlements on the River Plate. He persuaded Baird to lend him 1,500 men, and without any orders from home, he sailed across the Atlantic, and landed these troops near the city of Buenos Ayres. At first Beresford, who commanded them, carried all before him; but before long the Spaniards turned the tables so completely upon him, that he was compelled to surrender with all his men.

The Failure at Buenos Ayres, 1807.

Soon after the arrival of Craufurd's reinforcement our army commenced its march on Buenos Ayres (July, 1807); but unhappily the general in command was Whitelocke, a creature whose disgraceful incapacity and timidity (to use no stronger word) ruined the expedition. After several marches across plains swarming with Spanish horsemen, who used their lassos upon all stragglers with fatal effect, the troops arrived before Buenos Ayres; and the Spaniards themselves have since admitted that had we at once pushed straight on, the town would have surrendered. But Whitelocke hesitated so long that the inhabitants had ample time to place their capital in a state of defence. The houses were flat-roofed with strong parapets running round them; the windows were

few, and heavily barred; the mahogany doors were of immense thickness. Every man, woman, or child who could press a trigger was stationed at a loophole; each house became a fortress; trenches were dug across the streets and batteries planted in commanding positions. For some inexplicable reason Whitelocke ordered the flints to be removed from the muskets; and expected his men to engage in street fighting armed with pikes only and not with fire-arms! The attacking parties were sent into the town in small detachments, without cohesion, without orders, without reinforcements, without tools to breach the doors of the houses from which the inhabitants rained bullets upon them. Naturally the attack was a failure. Of the officers, seventy were killed or wounded and 120 were taken prisoners; 1,000 men were killed or wounded and 1,500 were taken prisoners; 1,500 muskets and at least three colours fell into the hands of the Spaniards. Instead of renewing the attack next day, as he could easily have done, Whitelocke agreed to retire altogether from the River Plate on the Spaniards releasing their English prisoners. The troops, raging at their defeat, were shipped home to England, where on his arrival Whitelocke was tried by court-martial and cashiered for his misconduct in South America.

The Effect of Wellington's Victories.

After such a long series of blunders and failures, is it surprising that Wellington's achievements in the Peninsula fairly intoxicated the British nation with success? It is scarcely too much to say that as during the eighteenth century England produced only three great captains, Marlborough, Wolfe and Clive, so in our long struggle with France the name of Wellington stands alone among our generals as that of a born leader of men.

W. LAIRD CLOWES. The Navy.

When the war with France recommenced, in 1803, Lord St. Vincent, who, during the four years ending in 1799 had held the Mediterranean command, was First Lord of the Admiralty. In the Mediterranean he had distinguished himself as one of the best organisers and disciplinarians of his time, and he had brought up to an extraordinary pitch of efficiency the fleet with which Nelson subsequently astonished the world;

but his reign at the Admiralty was not a success. He devoted himself in an inopportune moment to Dockyard reform, and to the making of a hundred petty economies; and there can be no doubt that his policy had the effect of rendering the hard work which confronted Nelson even more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Nor was St. Vincent's successor at Whitehall a more suitable man for the moment. Henry, Viscount Melville, may have been honest, but his transactions were at least so questionable as to procure his impeachment; and, although he was acquitted on all the ten articles exhibited against him, he left Westminster Hall a discredited politician. If England's captains had not at that crisis in her fortunes been better and stronger men than her administrators, things would indeed have gone hardly with her.

Improvements.

The general condition of the Navy during the Napoleonic War remained very much what it had been during the War of the French Revolution; but several improvements were made from time to time. In 1806, for example, increased rates of pay and pensions were granted; and in 1809 some considerable encouragements were offered to the Royal Marines. And in 1809, also, the Royal Naval Asylum became a fixed establishment, much to the advantage of the orphans and other children of the men of the service.

The improvements made in the *matériel* were more striking. The lifeboat invented by Mr. Henry Greathead, of South Shields, having been perfected, came into common use around our shores. The inventor received from the Society of Arts a gold medal and fifty guineas, from Parliament £1,200, and other rewards from the Trinity House and from Lloyd's; but it must be feared that his merits and memory have never been done full justice to. Captain John Shanks's invention of the sliding keel is another one that deserves notice. During the whole war vessels fitted with these keels were constantly employed, the effect of the device being to make shallow-draught craft sail faster, steer more easily, tack and wear more quickly, ride more comfortably at anchor, and take the ground with less risk. An invention which was in some sort the complement of Greathead's was the life-saving apparatus of Captain G. W. Manby, R.N. This was the prototype of the

Life-saving Apparatus.

modern rocket apparatus, and it consisted of a projectile, which, being attached to a line, was thrown from a mortar in such a manner as to carry the line across a wreck lying within a moderate distance of the point of discharge. Peril from water was scarcely, however, in those days of wooden ships, more pressing than peril from fire; and to cope with this, Lieutenant Jekyll, R.N., in 1811, perfected a method of transferring the common hand-pump then used in ships into a powerful fire-engine, which would throw a column of water over a 20-gun ship's top-gallant yard. It was worked on board the *Royal William*, by seven men, and found to throw a stream 76 ft. vertically and 108 ft. diagonally; but far better results were attained when the water of three pumps was united in a receiver with a single discharging pipe. Thereupon, it was fitted in the *Venerable* and *Tigre*, and all other ships of war were ordered to be supplied with it as they should come into port for repair.

Strength of the Navy.

The total vote for the Navy in 1803 was £10,211,378, and the number of seamen and marines maintained in the latter months of that year was 100,000. In the last year of the war the supplies amounted to £19,032,700, and the maximum number of seamen and marines maintained to 90,000. But in some of the intervening years a far larger number of men had been employed. In 1812, for example, it had been 145,000. Between 1803 and 1815, moreover, the number of officers naturally grew enormously. The admirals on the active list increased from 45 to 70; the vice-admirals, from 36 to 73; the rear-admirals, from 51 to 76; the post-captains, from 668 to 824; the commanders, from 413 to 762; the lieutenants, from 2,480 to 3,211; and the masters, from 529 to 666. The increase of *matériel* was proportionate. At the beginning of 1803, the number of ships of the line was 172, with a tonnage of 299,350; at the beginning of 1815, the number of ships of the line was 214, and the tonnage 389,961. But the increase in ships of other classes was even greater. The number of frigates grew from 184 to 245; and whereas in 1803 the total number of cruising ships of all classes was but 546, with a tonnage of 516,978, in 1815 it was 792, with a tonnage of 716,805. The number was at its highest in 1813, when it stood at 919, with a tonnage of 797,204; and in that year

there were in addition 90 troopships, store-ships, surveying-vessels, etc., bringing the gross number of ships of the Navy to 1,009, with a tonnage of 869,954. In the twelve years we added to the Navy, by capture from our various enemies, 33 ships of the line and 68 frigates, besides smaller craft to an enormous number; and of vessels which we did not subsequently adopt into the service, we captured or destroyed 36 of the line and 70 frigates.

W. H. HUTTON. The Church.

THE Church at the beginning of the nineteenth century had felt the full benefit of the Evangelical movement. It was no longer considered immoral, or even unfashionable, to be enthusiastic. The "Spiritual Quixote," that curious expression of a cynicism which aped orthodoxy, had made way for the serious and earnest appeals of writers profoundly influenced by Christian zeal, such as William Wilberforce and Hannah More. It is, indeed, on the lives of eminent laymen rather than in the published utterances of the clergy that the influence of the Church may best be traced. Closer to the heart of Dr. Johnson than even his Toryism was his sincere and pious churchmanship. Hannah More links the age of the "great lexicographer" to that of moderns like Macaulay and Freeman; and in her Church feeling she united principles which were active in both periods. Personal action, popular ballads, theological essays, even that odious weapon the didactic novel, were freely employed by Hannah More in defence of Christian faith during her long and devoted life. And it was as a churchwoman *par excellence* that she wrote. Of the Establishment she thought like Pope of the government of the universe, or the Duke of Wellington of the unreformed British Constitution :—

The Laity.

> "Nor do I think our Church wants mending;
> But I *do* think it wants attending."

And the name of Hannah More was a household word throughout England. The position of William Wilberforce was even more striking. A politician from his youth, he was the intimate friend of William Pitt and the influential adviser of many of the leading statesman. But he was famous still

more throughout the world as the enthusiastic and untiring advocate of the abolition of slavery, and as the one statesman of the day who placed religion before every other consideration. As the founder and supporter of many religious societies, as a philanthropist of unquestionable sincerity, and as a religious writer of wide popularity—his "Practical View" is certainly the best synopsis of the religious condition of society at the close of the eighteenth century—he furnished the best example of the practical effects of Evangelical teaching within the Church. The laity of the beginning of the nineteenth century had been educated under the influence of the Methodist revival, and the results were visible among many who could by no means be considered Evangelical. Southey, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, in very different ways, were profoundly touched by church feeling, and it came to them unquestionably through an atmosphere charged with Evangelicalism. Scott, on the other hand, was religiously one of the most powerful influences in the foundation of a new movement of sympathy with medievalism and historic continuity.

The Church and Politics.

The Church, again, had now shaken itself free from irresponsible attachment to any political party. There were again Tory bishops as well as Whig bishops. If the Evangelical party threw itself strongly into the new Conservatism which arose as a protest against the Revolution, there was still room for sound Whiggery among the parochial clergy. Dr. Parr was a worshipper of Charles James Fox, and he even dared to say "I hope, sir, you think that our Church established would not be the worse for a little republicanism."

The Episcopate.

The strength then of Church feeling in the country lay in the support of conscientious and eminent laymen. It would be impossible, in face of abundant testimony to the high character and power of many of the bishops, to condemn the episcopate as unworthy of its position. But the scandals in the exercise of Government patronage were by no means abolished, and there was not only a fine stock of "Greek-play bishops," but also a number of followers of Hoadly, to the "deady leaven" of whose Latitudinarianism Bishop Wilberforce was wont to attribute the worst features of the episcopal character which the

century produced. And it is unquestionable that a lack of moral fervour was still characteristic of the pulpit teaching. It was admitted and deplored by clerical critics themselves.*

The condition of churchmanship at the Universities affords an excellent example of the general tone. The great Dean of Christ Church, Cyril Jackson, was said to be much more than a bishop—he was a bishop-maker, for the Government consulted him on all appointments. He was hardly a great churchman. His successor was chiefly conspicuous for delaying his appearance at daily service till just before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom. It was an atmosphere, thought Thomas Jefferson Hogg, of "cold unedifying discourses, evidences, probabilities, credibilities, and the whole farrago of frigid rationalism." Such were the surroundings against which Shelley revolted and amid which the clergy whom Jane Austen immortalised were trained.

T. WHITTAKER. Science.

Increase of Progress.

From about the beginning of the nineteenth century the accumulation of scientific discoveries goes on at an accelerated rate. New general theories also are established which raise the more recent sciences to a higher level. To the present short period of twelve years are to be assigned the promulgation of the atomic theory in chemistry, and in optics the renewal of the undulatory theory in such a form as made its acceptance only a question of time. The mechanical theory of heat was prepared for by experimental work that effectually overthrew the doctrine of a material caloric. Botanical classification was systematised anew; and in the physiology of the nervous system a discovery was made that comes nearer in importance to Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood than anything that had been done for physiology in the interval.

Astronomy: Herschel.

In astronomy important work was done by Sir William Herschel (1738–1822), who, though born at Hanover, lived most of his life in England. With him must be associated his sister, Caroline Herschel (1750–1848), who not only aided his

* See especially "A Secular Essay," 1802, by Rev. J. Brewster, Vicar of Stockton-on-Tees, pp. 169-170.

astronomical observations, but herself discovered several comets, and detected many of the nebulæ included in her brother's catalogue. Herschel's most memorable discovery is that of the planet Uranus, which he made with one of his own improved reflecting telescopes in 1781. During the succeeding years mathematicians were occupied in trying to calculate its orbit. The result was that no supposition satisfied the observations except that of its planetary character. On this supposition, its motions were found completely conformable to the Newtonian astronomy. This was the first new planet to be added to the ancient list of seven. Herschel continued his observations on Uranus, and discovered part of its satellites. Among his later observations, those which he made on double stars were of special importance as adding to the proofs of the law of gravitation. In a series of papers addressed to the Royal Society from 1784 to 1818, he succeeded in determining the position of the sun among the stars.

Uranus.

A new form had now been given to chemical science by Lavoisier, who, taking up the discoveries of Priestley and Cavendish, had applied them to overthrow the doctrine of phlogiston, and had gone on to the construction of an immensely improved theory. Lavoisier's first memoir on the subject of his new theory appeared in 1775. In his "Traité Élémentaire de Chimie" (1789) he had drawn up a provisional list of chemical elements according to his system. The next great advance in chemical theory was made by John Dalton (1766–1844), who first communicated his ideas to his friend Dr. Thomson in 1804. For a considerable part of his life, Dalton was a teacher of mathematics at Manchester. Before turning his attention to chemistry, he had done important work in physics. The first germs of his atomic theory are found in a paper "On the Constitution of Mixed Gases," read before the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society in 1801. Having been struck with the applicability of the ancient atomic hypothesis in physics, he went on to apply it to chemistry, where he was able to give it such a form that the most general laws made out by experiment were immediately deducible from it. In the period preceding Dalton, the ideas of an "equivalency"

Chemistry: the New Departure.

Dalton's Atomic Theory.

between different weights of the different chemical elements, and of their combination in "definite proportions," had been approaching distinct formulation. Dalton, having at last formulated the laws of equivalency and of definite proportions with complete precision, showed further how they could be explained by supposing matter to consist of atoms, that is, particles not perhaps strictly indivisible, yet never actually divided in any chemical process. The atoms, or ultimate particles of the elements, possess definite weights, invariable for each element. Of these weights the ratios can be denoted by numbers. When elements unite with one another to form a compound, what takes place is union of the atoms in groups identical as to the number and character of their constituent atoms. These molecules or groups of atoms form the ultimate units of the compound so long as it remains chemically the same. Chemical decomposition involves redistribution of the atoms. From this conception, both the equivalency of a certain quantity of one element to a certain quantity of another, and the definite proportions of the quantities of the elements in a compound, necessarily follow. Dalton's law of "multiple proportions" follows from the power, which he supposes in the atom of an element, to combine with one, two or more atoms of other elements.

Dalton's first convert, Dr. Thomson, made the theory known in the third edition of his "System of Chemistry" (1807). Dalton himself gave his first statement of it to the public in his "New System of Chemical Philosophy" (Vol. I., 1808). As with all the great scientific theories, parts of Dalton's chemical theory had been more or less vaguely anticipated by others; but no one before him had applied it to systematise all the previously disconnected generalisations of chemistry according to a single conception. The new system rapidly made its way among chemists, and ever since it has been the foundation of the whole science.

Electrical Science and Chemistry.

While Dalton was making his great advance in chemical theory, an enlarged range was being given to experimental chemistry by electrical discoveries. In 1790 Galvani had observed the action of the limbs of a dissected frog when touched by pieces of two different metals. This observation added a new branch to electrical science. In 1800, Volta had completed the invention

of his electric pile, which was a device for multiplying the action of the new kind of electricity by repeating the arrangement of two metals in contact with a fluid capable of acting upon them chemically. In the same year Nicholson and Carlisle found that water was decomposed by the pile of Volta. This discovery was the starting-point of the electro-chemical researches of Sir Humphry Davy (1778–1829). Davy began his experiments in 1800. In 1807 he succeeded in decomposing caustic potash into oxygen and the metal potassium. The decomposition of soda and of the alkaline earths followed. In a paper read before the Royal Society, in 1806, Davy had put forward the conclusion that electro-chemical combinations and decompositions are referable to the law of electric attractions and repulsions, and had maintained that "chemical and electrical attractions are produced by the same cause, acting in the one case on the particles, in the other on the masses." His most notable experimental results thus came after the development of his theoretical views. In connexion with these results he continued to elaborate his electro-chemical theory, which ascribes a positively electric character to some elements, and a negatively electric character to others. This was afterwards carried further by Faraday.

Sir Humphry Davy's Researches.

Davy's researches on heat were of special importance as preparing for the mechanical theory. In a paper published in 1798 he sought to disprove the doctrine of a material caloric by showing the generation of heat through friction to an extent quite inexplicable on the received hypothesis. Researches on heat tending in the same direction had an important part among the varied investigations of Benjamin Thompson (1753-1814), better known as Count Rumford.

The Theory of Heat.

The names of Rumford and Davy are closely connected, not only by the similar direction and results of their researches on heat, but also by their common association with the Royal Institution. In 1799 the Royal Institution was projected by Count Rumford and Sir Joseph Banks; in 1800 it received its charter of incorporation, and Rumford himself selected Davy as the first lecturer there.

Count Rumford.

New laws of radiant heat were established by Sir John

Leslie (1766-1832), in his "Experimental Inquiry into the Nature and Propagation of Heat" (1804). Leslie here inclines to reject the "calorific and frigorific fluid," and suggests that some theory of vibration is probably the true one. In 1805 he succeeded Playfair in the chair of mathematics at Edinburgh. There was some unsuccessful theological opposition to his appointment, on the ground that he had maintained a view of cause and effect identical with that of Hume. This opposition gave occasion to the defence of Hume's doctrine of causation by Thomas Brown (p. 553).

Noteworthy discoveries both in chemistry and physics were made by William Hyde Wollaston (1766-1828), a great-grandson of the ethical writer, William Wollaston (p. 42). In particular, Wollaston discovered a number of new metals; invented the reflecting goniometer and the camera lucida; noticed the dark lines in the solar spectrum; and, by his process for the manufacture of platinum, was the first to make platinum crucibles available in the laboratory. He was one of the first to take up and advocate the atomic theory in chemistry. He had himself been on the verge of stating Dalton's law of multiple proportions; but, along with his accuracy in experimental work, there went a speculative caution which kept him back from making new generalisations of his own.

Wollaston's Discoveries and Inventions.

It is, of course, impossible even to mention all the investigations of importance in this period; but Dr. Wells's "Essay on Dew" (1814) is notable as a classical illustration of the inductive method. Wells, by varied experiments, showed that the deposition of dew is fully explained if we suppose the bodies on which it is deposited to be first cooled down, by radiation to a temperature at which the aqueous vapour in the air cannot all be retained in the gaseous state.

Wells's Theory of Dew.

The greatest name among the physicists of this period is Thomas Young (1773-1829). Young was a man of many powers and acquirements. He practised as a physician, and made important physiological researches on blood-pressure. He was a colleague of Davy at the Royal Institution. From 1802 he was foreign secretary to the Royal Society. As early as 1814 he had made considerable progress in the decipherment of

Young's Work in Optics.

Egyptian hieroglyphics, on which he published a work in 1823. His distinctive achievement, however, was to put the undulatory theory of optics on a firm basis of experiment and calculation. The theory that light is a vibratory motion of an ethereal medium filling all space had already been advocated by Hooke and Huyghens, but in an imperfect form; and the authority of Newton had caused the scientific world generally to accept the emission theory, according to which light consists of particles projected from luminous objects. Newton, it is to be remarked, had not altogether dispensed with the notion of an ether. And while Huyghens succeeded in explaining some phenomena better than Newton had done, his theory failed to explain others through assuming the vibrations of the luminiferous ether to be longitudinal—that is, in the direction of the ray—like the aerial vibrations which produce sound. Young was led to substitute the assumption of transverse for that of longitudinal vibrations, and was thus able to explain the many curious phenomena of diffraction, interference, polarisation, and double refraction, which had received no satisfying explanation either from the Newtonian theory of emission or from the older form of the undulatory theory. More than this, Young was able to predict phenomena hitherto unobserved. That was exactly what had not happened in the case of the emission theory. For every new phenomenon, the theory of emission had had to be complicated by a new hypothesis.

Young's optical investigations were not well received at first. His Bakerian lecture "On the Theory of Light and Colours" was attacked by Brougham in the *Edinburgh Review* (1803) as a dangerous relaxation of sound Baconian and Newtonian methods. Nor did scientific men take up his views with much more favour. In France, some years later than Young, Fresnel put forward the undulatory theory almost independently, and developed it with a more accomplished employment of mathematics. Though opposed at first by some of the older mathematicians, Fresnel's theory had able supporters, and at length gained the victory. Not till Young's theory came thus reinforced by the coincidence of Fresnel's, and by the acceptance of this in France, did it at last gain general acceptance in England.

Our present period is marked by a great advance in what

is known as the "natural system" of botanical classification.

Botany.

This advance was the work of Robert Brown (1773-1858), whose "Prodromus Floræ Novæ Hollandiæ et Insulæ Van Diemen" (Vol. I.) was published in 1810. In 1801 Brown had taken the post of naturalist to the expedition fitted out under Captain Flinders (p. 402) for survey of the coasts of New Holland. In 1805 he brought home nearly four thousand species of plants. Many of these being new, it was necessary to modify the "natural system" to make it capable of receiving them. The natural system itself Brown had adopted from the two Jussieus, whose classification was itself an advance on the "artificial system" of Linnæus. This artificial classification, when it was introduced, about the middle of the eighteenth century, was an immense reform of previous systems; for the earlier views, though they prefigured the modern notion of a natural classification, were not at the time capable of being worked out so as to make plants easily recognisable. The end of easy recognition was secured by the Linnæan classification, and the terminology and nomenclature of Linnæus have become a permanent possession; but a natural system, as Linnæus himself saw, was still a desideratum. By Brown the natural system was placed on a permanent basis. Still later, in the days of Darwin, the imperfectly understood aims of such a system—which had remained rather an affair of the naturalist's instinct than of logical definition—have been made intelligible by the idea of genetic connexion.

Animal Physiology: Sir Charles Bell.

The other great biological advance of the period was in animal physiology, and is due to Sir Charles Bell (1774-1842). In 1811 Bell published "A New Idea of the Anatomy of the Brain." Here he announced his discovery that different portions of the cerebro-spinal nervous system—ultimately, different fibres—have the function of conveying impressions of sense to the brain, and of conveying motor impulses from the brain. This specialisation of functions was unknown to Willis, whose "Anatome Cerebri" (1664) is the basis of the anatomical enumeration of the nerves still recognised. Willis and all succeeding anatomists down to Bell's time had supposed that the same portions of nervous substance perform sensory and motor functions indifferently. In reality, as Bell showed,

most of the cranial nerves are either purely sensory or purely motor. The posterior roots of the spinal nerves conduct only sensory impressions from the periphery; the anterior roots conduct only motor impulses to the periphery. To form the spinal nerves the primitive fibres of the roots unite in a single nervous cord, and then again separate to supply the muscles and the skin. Thus, although the particular arrangements of nerve-fibres in the nerves are not uniform, the antithesis of motor and sensory fibres is fundamental throughout. Another work of Sir C. Bell, the "Anatomy of Expression" (1804) is important for the stimulus it gave to the study of the relations between feeling and muscular movement, and remains a scientific classic.

Philosophy: Stewart and Brown.

To this period may be assigned Dugald Stewart (1753-1828) and Thomas Brown (1778-1820), both of whom are of greater interest in psychology than in philosophy proper. Both emerge from the school of Reid. Stewart, though in his psychology he laid more stress on association, remained attached to his master's doctrine, and helped to diffuse it by his eloquent expositions. In Brown, on the other hand, though he did not entirely break with Reid's doctrine of perception, there is observed a decided tendency to go beyond it, and a preparation for the doctrines of later English Associationism.

Brown's pamphlet on Hume's theory of causation (1804), had become in the third edition (1818) a treatise entitled "Inquiry into the Relation of Cause and Effect." Brown regards this relation as consisting in nothing but antecedence and sequence; at the same time he rejects Hume's scepticism, and admits an intuitive belief in the permanence and universality of the causal connexion. His general psychology is contained in his "Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind" (four vols.), published after his death. In 1851 this treatise had reached its nineteenth edition in England. Brown rejects the doctrine of "mental faculties" revived by Reid from the scholastic tradition, and treats psychology as phenomenal science dealing with states of consciousness and having analysis for its instrument. His theory of extension is especially valuable. Here he was

enabled to make advances by his analysis of touch into touch proper and "muscular sense." Brown tries to show how muscular sensations successive in time become grouped so as to give origin to the perception of positions as co-existing in space. This process he explains by laws of association, or, as he preferred to call it, "suggestion." He distinguished between "external" and "internal" affections of mind; and, for the latter, between "simple" and "relative" suggestion. To simple suggestion he referred memory and the like; to relative suggestion, acts of judgment, comparison, and so forth. His analysis of voluntary reminiscence and constructive imagination is ranked by later representatives of English psychology, along with what he did for the theory of perception, as an original contribution to the development of the general principle of association.

D'ARCY POWER. Medicine.

THE opening years of the present century were years of gloom and anxiety for the more far-seeing members of the medical profession in England. The brilliant men who had done so much for the advancement of medicine, surgery, and pathology during the earlier years of the reign of George III. were dead. William Hunter went to his rest in 1783, Percivall Pott died an old man in 1788, John Hunter (perhaps the greatest of the band) exactly ten years later. Matthew Baillie, indeed, continued to advance the work which his illustrious uncles had left unfinished, but he, Brodie, and perhaps Abernethy, are the only names which stand out above the general mediocrity of their contemporaries.

The Profession.

The College of Physicians and the Apothecaries' Society mantained the even tenour of their way, but the College of Surgeons had again fallen into bad hands, in spite of the attempt made to reorganise it when its Charter was granted in 1800. At this time it was unnecessary for one who desired to practise as a doctor to pass any examination. The majority of those who practised in the large towns took care to become members of the College of Physicians, of the College of Surgeons, or of the Apothecaries' Society, for it gave them a position which they could not otherwise attain. The membership of the College of Physicians was practically restricted

to the graduates of the older Universities. The membership of the College of Surgeons and of the Society of Apothecaries was obtained by apprenticeship and by the passing of examinations. The number of unlicensed practitioners and of Scotch graduates made the competition unduly keen for those who had gone to the expense of a better education. The Apothecaries in particular suffered severely. They were paid for the medicines which they supplied to their patients and not for their advice. A tax was put upon glass in 1812 and the price of bottles was thereby increased. This tax proved the breaking strain to the Apothecaries, for it reduced to a vanishing point the profits upon the draughts which they were accustomed to supply to their patients in packets of a dozen at a time. A meeting was held, July 3rd, 1812, and in the following year representations were made as to the necessity then existing for placing the apothecary, the surgeon-apothecary, and the practitioner in midwifery under the direction of a proper controlling body. A Society of Associated Apothecaries and Surgeon-Apothecaries was accordingly formed, with Dr. Mann Burrows as its moving spirit. An attempt was also made to establish an examining body independent of all the existing corporations, but the opposition of the two Colleges and of the Apothecaries' Society defeated the project. Much correspondence ensued between the Associated Apothecaries and the licensing bodies, and eventually the Society of Apothecaries agreed to introduce a new Bill into Parliament in a form approved by the College of Physicians, the College of Surgeons standing wholly aloof. This Bill passed the Legislature on January 15th, 1815, and it established the legal practice of medicine and surgery substantially upon its present basis.

The Practice of Medicine: Vaccination.

Vaccination made steady progress amongst the more cultured classes in England, whilst the enthusiasm of Ring and others enabled a large number of poor persons to be vaccinated gratuitously. The number of deaths from smallpox in London diminished rapidly. In 1804 only 622 died of this disease, and in 1811 only 751 died of the smallpox at a time when the total number of deaths in the metropolis was a little more than 17,000. These numbers compare favourably with the average of 1,200 to 2,000 deaths which had occurred during

the period 1761–1800. It is doubtful whether or not the whole of this decrease, or even its major part, was not due to a natural decline in the course which marks the course of every endemic disease after a period of unusual activity. A Parliamentary Committee was appointed in 1802 to consider the merits of vaccination and Jenner's claim to priority as the discoverer of the method. It reported favourably, and the House of Commons immediately voted that a sum not exceeding £10,000 should be "granted to his Majesty, to be paid as a remuneration to Dr. Edward Jenner for promulgating the discovery of the vaccine inoculation, by which mode that dreadful disease the smallpox was prevented." A further sum of £20,000 was voted in a similar manner on July 29th, 1807, and on June 8th, 1808, a National Vaccine Establishment was formed. It has now become a part of the Local Government Board, and has kept up an uninterrupted supply of lymph for the purposes of vaccination throughout the country.

Dr. Creighton, in his "History of Epidemics in Britain," says there were several fatal epidemics of measles in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These epidemics were isolated, and it was not until the end of the eighteenth century that measles, whooping-cough, and scarlet fever began to assume their present deadly attitude towards infants and children. The deaths from whooping-cough rose steadily during the eighteenth century from zero in 1704 and 1705 to a maximum of 573 in the year 1780. The disease, however, was not a new one, and the increase was due in part to a better system of classification and in part to a more accurate nomenclature. Convulsions are a frequent cause of death in whooping-cough, and as the item convulsions diminishes in the returns whooping-cough, the real cause of death, increases.

Epidemics.

The beginning of the nineteenth century, too, appears to have been marked by several epidemics of scarlet fever, one of which was preceded by a remarkable epidemic of an apparently analogous disease which is said to have killed off "myriads" of cats. It was not until later in the century, however, that the full force of the disease in its most fatal forms was felt in England. Dysentery, on the other hand, began to decrease in intensity, and almost ceased to be epidemic. It had been very prevalent during the eighteenth century

and was especially fatal during the years 1758-62 and 1780-82. There was also a remarkable decline in the number of deaths from typhus and other continued fevers in England during the years 1803-1816. This decline was synchronous with the great increase of prosperity due to the rise in wages which resulted from the war expenditure of these years.

The Army Medical Service.

The organisation of the army medical service in 1799 is known to us through the regulations of the Army Medical Board, issued to regimental surgeons in September of that year. There were no intermediate grades at this time between the members of the Medical Board and the Inspector-General, who were usually civilians, and the regimental surgeons. The surgeons were nominated to their regiments after passing an examination, at first carried out by the Surgeons' Company, but afterwards by a special board constituted for the purpose. They possessed considerable authority, and were in some matters independent of their commanding officers. They were allowed to deduct four shillings a week from the pay of each sick soldier for the purpose of providing a hospital dietary, "with every reasonable comfort and indulgence that can be afforded." It is specially enjoined that the finest wheaten bread and fresh meat were to be given to the sick. Wine and malt liquors, however (spirits are not specified), were provided at the expense of the Government. They were to be administered personally by the surgeon or his assistant, but when this was impossible they were to be mixed with the medicine or with the food of the patient, so as to make them less palatable. Hospital beds were to be provided for four per cent. of the strength. A nurse was also to be provided. She was to receive a shilling a day, to prepare slops and comforts for the sick, to wash for them, and occasionally to assist in administering their medicines and in cooking their rations.

R. HUGHES. Art.

SPACE does not enable us to refer, except in the briefest and most perfunctory manner, to the successors and followers of Lawrence, who came to the front in what we may term the Napoleonic Era, such as Harlow—best known by his stagey "Trial of Queen Catherine"—John Jackson, Thomas Phillips, William

Owen, and Martin Archer Shee. With the exception of Harlow most of their best work was done subsequently, and like Watson Gordon, Howard, Hilton, Etty, and Haydon, they really belong to a later day.

From the chronological point of view, the same is true of David Wilkie, but as most of the works which form the foundation of the school of English genre were painted in the period under review, he demands notice here. He was the son of a Scotch minister, born in 1785, at Cults, in Fifeshire, and his bent—even as a child—towards art was so marked, that despite the prejudice natural to a Presbyterian family, his father despatched him at fourteen to the Trustees Academy at Edinburgh. It was then under the direction of the insipid historical painter, John Graham, R.A., who as a teacher had this merit—that he kept Wilkie at work on the human figure. Though Wilkie worked steadily at large figure subjects he was conscious that his talents lay in another direction. At eighteen he returned to Cults and found his subject in the annual fair that took place in the neighbouring village of Pitlassie. In colour and workmanship it is not much like his maturer work, but it is vigorously conceived. Wilkie was then only nineteen, but he was bent on going to London, which a successful sale of the "Fair" for £25 enabled him to do. At twenty we find him settled in London and a student at the Academy, and before his twenty-first birthday he had painted the "Village Politicians," and had written to his father, "I have the vanity to hope that Scotland will one day be proud of David Wilkie." In the succeeding years he painted "The Blind Fiddler," "The Letter of Introduction," "The Village Festival," and "Blindman's Buff." In May, 1812, he had done sufficient to warrant an exhibition "of his own pictures." He was made an Associate at the earliest age allowed by the rules, and in 1811 became a full Academician.

The Beginnings of Genre: David Wilkie.

A fine feeling for colour, though even in his earlier time inclining to heaviness, distinguishes all his works; but the finesse, the spirit, the movement, of his groups is unequalled. Later, after his long second tour on the Continent, during which he visited Paris, Munich, Rome, and Madrid, he changed his methods and subjects, greatly for the worse. He had

been much impressed by what he had seen, particularly in Spain, and came back "determined to try a bolder and more effective style." It was in this manner that he painted his later historical subjects, but he was quite out of his depth, and these, and among them the famous "Preaching of John Knox," are disappointing. It was after his journey that he became so reckless in the use of asphaltum, which, if it gave a rich quality at first, made for blackness in the end. If in his latter works his influence both in method and manner was evil, in those of his earlier days it was excellent. Above all Wilkie deserves to be remembered as the pioneer who added a new field to be tilled by English artists. It was in truth a new kind of art, and one which Englishmen could practise with success, that was ushered in by Wilkie. He taught his countrymen how a story of humble contemporary life, not a satire nor a sermon, might be told on canvas so as to be interesting and yet remain a work of art. He showed them, too, that this was as possible in the England of the Regency, as it had formerly been in Republican Holland.

Slow as was the progress of landscape art in English studios, the appreciation of landscape by the public outside was still slower. Wilson died in the utmost penury because no one would buy the genuine gold of his skies, or his pinchbeck Italian scenery. Gainsborough's landscapes fared no better, though they were, in spite of all defects, full of the most vivid impressions of the country, inspired by the truest feeling for its natural beauty. The conquest of public opinion by the landscape painter had to wait for the admirable prose of Constable, and for the marvellous poetry of Turner. But in the interval between the defeat of Wilson and Gainsborough, and Constable's and Turner's victory, a generation of artists lived and worked, not entirely without result. Some of these turned chiefly towards the Dutch masters, some towards Wilson, some towards Gainsborough, and at least one towards Nature herself.

Later Landscape.

First among them comes George Morland. He was born in 1763 in London, the son of an artist, who, as an engraver and pastelist, had some reputation. He was another of the interminable series of infant prodigies, and at ten exhibited drawings at the Academy. He was regularly trained by his father, who, out of regard to

George Morland.

his morals, refused to allow him to go to the Academy School to consort with the students. As regards artistic training the plan was a success. He learned to draw well, and his bits of colour are always well placed and effective. But as regards young Morland's morals it was an abject failure. From a very early age he gave himself up to idleness and drink, painting only for the means of debauchery. This was his uniform course through life, and his marriage with the sister of his friend, Ward, the animal painter, which occurred when he was twenty-three, did not materially improve matters. He was continually in debt. Sometimes he was locked up and allowed to paint himself back to liberty; at other times he would evade the writs of indignant creditors by taking to a nomad life in the country, sleeping in barns and low taverns, or camping out with the gipsies. To great facility of execution he joined a keen observation and a retentive memory, and this enabled the painter to utilise the experiences of the fugitive debtor. His death in a sponging house, at the age of forty-two, appropriately closed a consistently vicious career. It lent, however, a fictitious sort of glamour to his name, and added to the vogue enjoyed by his pictures. They are chiefly pastoral subjects, and he shows much affinity with Gainsborough, particularly in his treatment of foliage. His drinking scenes are numerous; and so are his barns with rough country horses at the manger, his wayside inns with travellers resting, his night poachers, and his gipsy encampments. Realist in spirit, he had many artificial tricks, and constantly repeats an artificial chord of colour. He was a thorough artist, however, and even in his most commonplace subjects he manages to interest the eye, and his colour is occasionally exquisite. Unlike most of the men of his day, Ibbetson and Sir George Beaumont for instance, whose work is that of an attenuated Wilson, Morland is always himself. It was reserved for this drunkard to show his countrymen how readily the idyllic life of an English countryside lends itself to the needs of the artist. His art was in no sense great, but it was art, intelligible and enjoyable, and he taught the public to admire it.

Probably the taste for realistic landscape created by Morland made the way easy for Patrick Nasmyth. He was the son of a Scottish landscape painter, who in turn had been

a pupil of the honest if uninspired Ramsay, and he came to London in 1805, two years after Morland's death. Scotchman though he was, he had a keener eye for the simple pastoral beauty of the South of England, its rich pasture and pleasant lanes. His manner has great affinity to the Dutchmen, and particularly to Wynants, whom he resembles, both in clearness and simplicity of colour and subject. His somewhat tight and hard manner of painting is in striking contrast to Morland's; but it had in it the same elements of popularity: it was pretty and intelligible. The same may be said of Nasmyth's contemporary Callcott, afterwards Sir Augustus; who from choir-boy to Royal Academician had a career of typically respectable success. But the taste for landscape had now definitely set in, and Callcott's pastures with cattle and river, and occasionally coast scenes, are pleasant enough, and, indeed, he sometimes paints a sunny tide-way with rare felicitousness. He studied under Hoppner, obtained the dignity of Associate in 1806, and that of Academician in 1810. His early success makes it natural to mention him here; but he struck out no new path, and had little or no influence on the art of his country.

Nasmyth and Callcott.

There is one landscape artist, however, who, if fate had been kinder, might have had the glory of founding modern landscape. This was John Crome, of Norwich, who was born in 1768, and was largely the anticipator of Constable, though hardly of Turner. Other painters have had to breast the blows of circumstance, some with much, some with very little, adventitious aid; but John Crome had no aid from any source whatever. He was the son of an artisan, a weaver, and his home was in a second-rate provincial town where there was no art school or museum. He was brought up almost without any schooling, and from the age of eleven, or thereabouts, earned his own living—first as an apothecary's errand boy, and then as a house-painter's apprentice. Sign-painting for public-houses seems to have formed part of his master's calling, and thus he acquired in some sort the rudiments of his art. But the only serious education he received came from himself, and consisted in the conscientious copying of the Dutch and Flemish landscapes of a Mr. Hervey, of Catton. Anyhow, it served its

Old Crome.

purpose so well that he ventured to set up as a drawing-master. He gained a large *clientèle*, but did not give up his practice in sign-boards, and this and his drawing lessons kept the family. But from the first he made landscape sketches, and these are full of individuality, and show a distinct advance. Gainsborough, with his infallible instinct for landscape, had painted tree masses with perfect feeling; but Crome, more accurate in drawing, and with a stronger grip of a kind—though not the most pleasing kind—of natural beauty, painted the trees themselves, and painted them in the spirit in which Reynolds painted men. In Crome's works, too, we find, perhaps, the earliest example of the modern feeling for the impressiveness of every-day scenes. Crome, though clearly at times affected by Wilson's pictures, does not need to go to the Campagna to get the feeling of loneliness and isolation. The flat country of Norfolk, with its little rising and falling of the ground that does duty for hills and valleys, serves his purpose as well as the wilderness or the Himalayas. A perfect example of this power is the "Mousehold Heath near Norwich"—now in the National Gallery—a work, says a French critic, "of such simplicity that only a master could have given it grandeur. It represents a long slope of pale verdure, which, from a foreground of weeds and heather, mounts quickly towards the sky. Big golden clouds float over the rounded top of the hills. There is nothing more. Yet with this little, Crome has given the perfect similitude of solitude and stillness. In this little fold of earth, which not a breath of wind ruffles, not a sound disturbs, one might think oneself as far from the busy town as anywhere in the world. It is the desert, and the majesty of the desert." Crome's art is the art of the centre; but just because its environment was unfavourable, its influence was small. Though a friend of Beechey's, he never exhibited at the Academy until 1806, when he was over forty. During the fifteen years which elapsed between that day and his death, little more than a dozen of his pictures were seen in London. But in 1803 he gathered the artists of Norwich together into a society, which, though not fated to exercise a great influence, or to become a permanent factor in our art-life, yet has more right to be termed a school than anything that England had for half a century.

The Norwich School.

To this school belonged John Sell Cotman, himself a Norwich man, though trained in London, who, besides painting numerous sea-pieces in oils, was distinguished as a water-colourist and as an etcher. Some of his etchings, many of which are architectural, are of fine quality. To the same school belonged James Stark, Crome's pupil, whose manner, though a little dry, lacking the largeness of his master, is simple and true to Nature. Crome's other famous pupil was George Vincent, who was of more versatile temperament. His most famous work is a noble view of Greenwich Hospital as seen from the river, which is crowded with shipping and full of sunlight. But perhaps the pupil who came nearest to Crome in sentiment was Robert Ladbrooke, who married a sister of Crome's wife. His woodland scenes and views in the neighbourhood of Norwich, while thoroughly naturalistic, frequently attain the grave, impressive beauty of Crome himself. The sons of both artists followed in their fathers' steps; but, with the exception of John Bernay Crome, who became famous for his moonlight scenes, never achieved more than a local reputation. The Norwich Society was not long-lived. Their last exhibition was in 1818; and with the death of John Crome, in 1821, the Norwich School ceases to be a distinguishable entity.

We postpone all considerations of the career of the two men to whom we have before referred as the two greatest painters of English landscape—Constable, the great master of its eloquent prose, and Turner, the great landscape poet. We are constrained to do this because, though both were born and educated within the period under review, the work which fixes their prominence was executed later. The country-bred John Constable (1776–1837), to whom landscape owes its final emancipation from convention, was not only slow in making himself felt by his contemporaries, but even in realising wherein his true strength lay. Indeed, it was not till 1802 that he became fixed in his design to become "a natural painter," and never more "to seek the truth at second hand." But in 1813 he was still painting portrait heads at fifteen guineas (though it must be owned this was done for the sake of a living), and his large landscape of "The Lock," of 1814, was so unsuccessful that in later years he got it back, and gave the owner a totally

Constable's Early Painting.

new version in exchange. Still, though the time from 1802 to 1815 was not idly spent by Constable, it was the seed-time rather than the harvest. Constable's genius, which was destined to revolutionise the landscape art of Europe, had yet to wait not only for general homage but for general recognition.

The Early Work of Turner.

Turner, who was born in April, 1775, in Maiden Lane, London, a year before Constable, and who did not die till 1851, had not to complain that his contemporaries did not recognise his talent. At twenty-four he was an Associate, and three years later (in 1803) an Academician. We have something to say elsewhere of his early mastery of water colour work. In water colour, in oils, and as an etcher, his skill of execution was equally amazing. His "Liber Studiorum" is the most exquisite collection of engraved landscapes that exists; and it is noteworthy that some of the etchings done by his own hand actually surpass the original studies. Nevertheless, finished artist as he was in many different fields, during the period under review, and, indeed, up to his Continental journey of 1819, he is in the imitative stage. The oil-paintings of the earlier period have been called the works of a student, and, prodigious as they are, the dictum is true of them in the sense that they repeat the manner, first of one master and then of another. At first it is Wilson and the Dutch marine painters; then it is Poussin and Claude, and occasionally it is Morland that is imitated. But though the imitations frequently surpass the original in every noble quality of art, there can be no question but that they are imitations. Turner—the world's wonder, the master of every enchantment of streaming light and radiant cloud perspective, Turner painting in the manner of Turner, the Turner of "The Fighting *Téméraire*," and the "Childe Harold Pilgrimage" and the "Polyphemus Deriding Ulysses"—belongs to the period of the long peace, not to the era of warfare that ended in 1815.

Miniature Painting.

The art of the miniaturist, the earliest fruit of the English talent for portraiture, reached, as we have seen, its most flourishing epoch in the times of the Stuarts. Samuel Cooper, the contemporary of Pepys, whose delicate heads are unsurpassed by later or earlier workers, represents the fourth generation from the Elizabethan Nicholas Hilliard. Flatman

and Alexander Browne, Boit and Lens and Goupy carried on the succession into the eighteenth century. George II. and Caroline of Anspach patronised the miniature painters and enamellists of their day. Michael Moser, the first keeper of the Royal Academy, and Nathaniel Hone and Meyer, who were contemporaries of the great portrait painters, were all Academicians of the first installation. Ozias Humphrey and Collins, Meyer's pupil, Samuel Shelley and James Nixon, equally deserved and obtained patronage, both for portraits and small historical subjects. The most famous of the miniaturists of the century was, however, Richard Cosway, born in 1740. He was like Sir Joshua, a Westcountryman, the son of a schoolmaster, and, like him, a pupil of Hudson. He was celebrated not only for his heads, but for small full-lengths, the figure deftly sketched and the face finished with the utmost care. An extraordinary though slightly monotonous sweetness of expression, a universal grace, and very taking colour, make his work easily recognisable. No painter has possessed the gift of flattery more perfectly, nor used it with greater hardihood. It is said that he drew all the beauties of the day and all that wished to be beauties, and always gave satisfaction. At thirty he was elected an Associate, and in the following year an Academician. His wife was also a miniaturist, and the pair, owing to the eccentric vanity and talent of the husband, and the beauty and flightiness of the wife, became more than the fashion. In the midst of his gay career Cosway became a Swedenborgian, and, according to his assertion, held interviews with more than one person of the Trinity, and had sittings from the Virgin Mary. His wife abandoned him in 1804, and after a luxurious life in the Paris of the Empire became superior of a religious house at Lyons. He lived to be over eighty, and left behind him a vast body of most attractive work.

Richard Cosway.

Cosway's most famous imitator was Henry Edridge, who was also distinguished as a mezzotint engraver and as a landscape painter and architectural draughtsman. After this the art declined, though fine works of this class, both on ivory and paper, were executed by Alfred Chalon, and in enamel by Henry Bone, who was appointed Royal Enamellist by George III., an honour which was confirmed to him by the two succeeding sovereigns.

Engraving.

Not the least important of the artistic developments of the eighteenth century was that which occurred towards the end of its third quarter in connection with book illustration and engraving. Works like Alderman Boydell's "Shakespeare" had, as we have seen, found employment for famous and fashionable artists such as Romney and West, Northcote and Opie. But besides the greater names, among which that of Angelica Kauffmann must be counted, mention might be made of a host of the lesser artists. Such were Mortimer (the youth who took away a prize from Romney), Wheatley, justly celebrated for the prettiness of his rustic genre, Hamilton and Cipriani, Smirke and Richard Westall. Amongst this crowd were two men of such peculiar and individual talent, that they cannot be passed over. These were William Blake and Thomas Stothard. Both were (in effect) Londoners, and almost of the same age, the former being born in 1757, the latter in 1755.

Stothard.

Stothard, like Lawrence, was the son of an innkeeper. His chief training came from his being apprenticed to a pattern draughtsman for silk fabrics. It was a peculiar school, but in it he learned the value of line and balance in composition. His manner of treating masses in low relief, and the grace of his composition, as we see them in his famous design for the Wellington Shield, are highly suggestive of the uses of this training. He had a passionate love for the art of the illustrator, and quickly found work from the publishers. He illustrated all the poets (in Bell's famous edition) from Homer downwards, though anything less heroic than Stothard's pencil can scarcely be conceived. Pathos he reached occasionally, but tragedy never; graceful mirth too, now and then, but glee and broad humour were beyond him. "It seems," says Mr. Ruskin, "as if he could not conceive wickedness and coarseness or baseness. Everyone of his figures looks as if it had been copied from some creature who had never harboured an unkind thought or permitted itself an ignoble action. With this intense love of purity is joined a love of mere physical smoothness and softness, so that he lived in a universe of soft grass and stainless fountains, of tender trees and stones at which no foot could stumble." It is true that nothing could be more pitiable than every endeavour by Stothard to express facts beyond his own sphere;

but within it he was a master. He was a most prolific worker, too, his designs having been estimated at four thousand, and this is probably an under-estimate. He was curiously without any of the *mauvaise honte* of the artist; nothing came amiss to him. Pocket-books, keepsakes, fashion books, children's books; anything and everything he touched with the same simple and effeminate grace. His merit was greatly appreciated by the Academicians, and he was elected a member of their body in 1794. He painted in oils, too, though these are probably among his feeblest productions. Stothard has been often compared to Fra Angelico, and Turner declared that he was the Giotto of England!

Blake.

While Stothard is the type of all that is calm, simple, graceful, and happy, even to ineffectiveness and monotony, Blake is the wildest figure in the history of English art and letters. He was apprenticed to the younger Basire, an engraver of repute, but while earning his bread by engraving during the day—some of Stothard's blameless inventions were executed by him—he employed his nights in mysterious and visionary compositions. In these he was poet and prophet, illustrator and engraver, all in one. His work of all kinds is surprising in its inequality. In some fragments of his verse—for instance, like the lines to "The Evening Star"—there are passages of such perfection as are not to be matched by any poet of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, much of it is unintelligible, some of it absolutely absurd. So, too, of his drawing; part is graceful, brilliant, and effective; part incoherent and violent, and even grotesque. His methods, too, were equally various. Thus his "Songs of Experience" were executed in a most extraordinary manner, which he explained as the result of a direct revelation from his brother Robert, in a vision of the night. He used all kinds of pigments without oil, including metallic gold and silver, and with singular success. His skill in this kind of iridescent colouring is marvellous, to be only partially gauged by the singular figure in the National Gallery, "The Spiritual form of Pitt guiding Behemoth." This was a companion to a figure of Nelson engaged in similar avocations, and is not too intelligible. But Blake was not content with allegories of so comparatively simple a character. From the heights of Heaven to the abyss of Hell, and from the souls of heroes and virgins,

the personification of thunder, of God the Father, and Death plucking down the sun, to the Canterbury pilgrims and the ghost of a flea—nothing was too great or too small for his voracious imagination to feed upon. It is not surprising that with such a temperament he was always seeing visions. Not only in Westminster Abbey did ghosts of great men rise and walk with him, but in the unromantic roads of Peckham Rye he saw trees "full of angels," and at Fulham he was present at a fairy's funeral. A madman, but a truly inspired madman, is the verdict of posterity on Blake. That he should have found scant encouragement in the era of the French Revolution, and in the England of the Regency, is not to be wondered at. He died in great poverty, having lived true to the faith of his youth, that his business was not "to gather gold but to make glorious shapes expressing godlike notions." His influence was less than nothing with his contemporaries, but it was unquestionably felt by one considerable painter whose death is still recent and who, like Blake, was a great poet.

Bewick.

Another intensely individual artist, almost exactly contemporary with Blake and Stothard, remains to be noticed, and, though he worked in a much humbler sphere, he contributed greatly to the progress of English art. This was Thomas Bewick, born in 1753 at Newcastle-on-Tyne. If he did not rediscover, he reintroduced the art of wood engraving in England. His book of quadrupeds, and his history of British birds, show a really extraordinary gift. A profound knowledge of natural history, of animal gesture and expression, was coupled with a unique faculty for interpreting the texture of fur and feather, and a quaint but genuine humour. It is noticeable, too, that his landscape settings are realistic, and sometimes of singular elegance. He was helped in many of these last by his brother, and one Robert Johnson, both of whom were among his pupils. To Bewick belongs the merit of having founded the school of wood-engravers, which has persisted to the present day, and given scope to so much and such varied talent.

The Humorists at the end of the Century.

Bewick was, as we have indicated, a humorist in his quiet way, but he lived in an age when something more virile, concrete, and topical was generally demanded. There was still a market for

satire of the Hogarthian type, even though it contained hardly any of the Hogarthian flavour. But Hogarth's imitators—some of whom, like Sandby, were of his enemies, and others, like Collett, of his friends—were, on the whole, a feeble folk. The imitation is obvious; but one has only to compare the people, say in such a work as de Loutherbourg's "At Spring Gardens," to see every coarseness and exaggeration of Hogarth — the brutal mouth, the dwarfed figure, the big head, coarsened and exaggerated, and without the justification offered by his unparalleled ingenuity.

But the troubles that preceded, and the wars that followed, the French Revolutionary movement seem to have first awakened, and then favoured the growth, of a new form of pictorial satire. Politics became all-absorbing, and the populace were as excited as their betters. Sayer, Bunbury, Woodward, Boyne, and a long list of less known men, thus found not only inspiration but a ready sale for their works. The great development, or revival, in satirical art is, however, chiefly associated with the names of two men, James Gillray and Thomas Rowlandson. The first of these, Gillray, was the son of a trooper who had fought at Fontenoy. Like Bewick, he was a North-countryman, and, like Hogarth, he was apprenticed to a metal-chaser. He, too, is said to have been an infant prodigy, and to have drawn and etched a plate at the age of twelve. The first work certainly his is, however, dated in 1779, when he was twenty-four. He entered the Academy in that year, and thenceforth, through the long period of the struggle with France, he poured out a series of squibs, pasquinades, and satirical invectives which for vigour and brutality have never been surpassed. An excellent and expressive draughtsman, with a considerable gift of arrangement and composition, and, as a satirist, hitting always as hard as he could, he seems to have taken his motto from one of the Frenchmen whom he hated so cordially—"*L'audace, et l'audace, et toujours l'audace.*" His virulent attacks on France, the French Revolution, and the English sympathisers with France, were naturally popular with the king and queen, and the Gillray drawings were supplied regularly at Windsor. A typical example of this sort is "The State Dinner to

Gillray.

Dumouriez at St. James's." It represents the victorious general as the most horrible type of *sans culotte*, flourishing a dagger, and waited on by the Opposition chiefs, Tooke and Fox and Sheridan. Among the *plats* are a royal crown and a bishop's mitre, while the head waiter, Charles James Fox, is putting on table a calf's head that bears the familiar features of William Pitt. Gillray's caricatures of Napoleon and his family, Napoleon baking gingerbread kings, or as Gulliver sailing his boat in the presence of the Brobdingnagians George and Charlotte, Josephine as a *poissarde*, and similar indecencies, equally commended themselves to the royal taste. Nor does it seem that the old king and queen were much shocked by "The Anti-Saccharites"—the royal couple teaching the sulky princesses the advantages of drinking tea without sugar, the king repeating "Delicious! delicious!"—or with the brutal realism of the "Affability," where the king is bawling into the ear of a stone-deaf and frightened peasant. His most audacious drawing is the famous "Sin, Death, and the Devil," the queen (whom he always makes a gap-toothed hag) interfering between Pitt and Thurlow. This was an insult not to be forgiven, but the loss of Court favour did not seem to matter to Gillray. Mrs. Humphreys's shop window in St. James's Street, where his pictures were sold, and which is represented in "Very Slippy Weather," continued to be besieged. Repulsive as he often is, nothing can be more spirited than Gillray at his best, and many of his drawings look as if they had been evolved under the stress of genuine passion. He did not long survive the fall of Napoleon, the target of his most venomous satire, and his last years were clouded by imbecility.

Rowlandson.

The pictorial satire of Thomas Rowlandson was wider in its scope, less violent, but also less vigorous than Gillray's. Indeed, his best works have little relation to caricature. The pair of confidential young ladies on a sofa, for example, in the favourite drawing called "Harmony," have an elegance that is akin to Gainsborough's art, and the suggestion of kinship is further strengthened by his brilliant drawing of their elaborate *chevelures*. He came of a middle-class stock, and at sixteen entered the Academy. He, however, soon quitted London for Paris, where his aunt lived. There he received an excellent training, and he

returned to England a complete master of his trade. In London he began seriously enough: had a studio in Wardour Street, and sent portraits and figure subjects to the Academy. But later on he gave himself up to the playful and humorous delineation which made his name. His sketching at all times is brilliant and decisive; he is a master of outline; his figures are full of movement and frequently of grace. Add to this, that he was the most prolific artist of them all. Less engrossed with politics, or with the *chronique scandaleuse* of that most scandalous period, than his contemporaries, his drawings are a mine of wealth to the student of manners. Racing, hunting, coaching, the barracks, the counting-house, the colleges of Oxford, the theatre, the coffee-house, the fencing-room, dog-fights, fairs, levées, the cries of London, hunt dinners—all the humours of the town and country came with equal ease to him. His satire is, as a rule, of a gentle character, and only occasionally he deals a swashing blow at some imposture, as in the famous death-bed, where he shows the sufferer surrounded by a room-full of friends and physicians, and of all present only one is compassionate, and that is Death. He was, too, particularly happy in those *Reisebilder* of which Hogarth was the pioneer. The most important of these are the "Tour to the Wreck of the *Royal George*," in 1782; "The Excursions to Brighthelmstone," in 1789; and the "Tour to North and South Wales," which dates from 1800. Among the drawings interspersed among the letterpress (provided by his friend Wigstead), there is one, "The Young Ladies of Lymington in a Strong Wind," that inevitably reminds one of John Leech. He died in 1827, after a protracted illness.

Isaac Cruikshank.

Among the many rivals of Gillray and Rowlandson, Isaac Cruikshank deserves special mention, not only for his own work, but as being the father of the long-lived and popular George. The elder Cruikshank devoted himself almost entirely to politics; but satire was probably not his *forte*—rather a serious and not ungraceful realism. If one compares such drawings as "A General Fast, Lambeth," with such works as its companion, "Spitalfields," the contrast is striking. The realistic group of the wife of the starving weaver and her children is elegant. The caricature of the guzzling Archbishop is childish. He died

about 1811, leaving behind him two sons, Robert and George. Both were artists, but it was on the younger that the father's mantle conspicuously fell. The father died of alcoholism, and in this doubtless lies the explanation of the almost fanatical passion with which, to the last hour of his long and busy life, his son George fought against the liquor traffic. Within two years of his father's death, he was at work drawing. His "Court of Love," of which the Regent and Lady Hertford are the tutelaries, bears date 1st November, 1812. The young satirist, barely turned eighteen, has already commenced his crusade against drunkenness and his freedom not only in the words he puts into the mouths of his personages but in the representation of the characters, is prodigious. The picture of the favourite, drunk, seated on the knee of the Regent, with her husband standing by, is startling, even in an age of licence. But George Cruikshank, although he began thus early, and though in spirit he recalls the era of the Restoration, as a worker belongs to the later nineteenth century, not to the Napoleonic era.

George Cruikshank's Early Work.

The eighteenth century, and particularly the latter half of it, was prolific in almost all branches of art. Besides the great portrait and landscape painters in oils and the great designers and illustrators, many Englishmen attained fame and fortune as pastellists. Their work, it is true, mostly strikes us now as careful, hard, and somewhat uninteresting as art, but its wonderful permanence makes it extremely valuable as history. Francis Knapton, who died in 1788, at the age of ninety, may be considered the founder of the school, and William Hoare, the teacher of Lawrence and Francis Cotes and his pupil, John Russell, were his most distinguished followers. Engraving, too, in all its branches, including mezzotint and etching, made great strides at this time. Before the reign of George III. most of the engravers of note, like Hollar and Simon, had been foreigners, though here and there a few English names occur. But a whole group of Englishmen and naturalised foreigners now come to the front. Such were Vivarès and Woollet, famous for their skill in rendering foliage, Bartolozzi, Sir Robert Strange, Fittler, Sharp and Sandby—this last an Academician, who reproduced his own

Pastellists.

Engravers.

pictures in aquatint. More than a hundred mezzotint engravers are said to have found employment in reproducing the works of Sir Joshua alone.

Mezzotint.

English water colour painting in the eighteenth century may be, not improperly, regarded as a fresh art, and in its final results, if not in its immediate harvest, it is the most important of all the new departures of the period. Of course, water colours were old, older than oils, nor was water colour painting on paper an entirely new thing. The Dutch painters had produced finished water colour drawings a century before, and the miniaturists had worked successfully with the same materials in the days before ivory came into use. But the difference between such work and that of Turner's ripened skill is a difference not of degree only but of kind. This gives unusual point to the fact that the practice of our early water-colourists was derived neither from Dutchmen like Ostade and Dusart, nor from Englishmen like Cooper and Flatman. It clearly grew out of the stained, washed, or tinted drawings of the architectural draughtsmen. These men, the humble helpers of the antiquarian and the annalist, yet worked directly from Nature, and so set down their immediate impressions, unconscious of the charm that such directness and immediateness possesses. From this class, too, the artists sent out by the Government on scientific cruises were naturally chosen, and thus Captain Cook, on his last voyage in 1776, took John Webber on his ship, while William Alexander accompanied Lord Macartney's mission. Some of the Chinese sketches of the last-named artist are, indeed, fully coloured; but this was in 1792. Paul Sandby, whom George III. employed as a drawing master, was born in 1725, so that he truly belongs to the primitive time; but, then, he hardly got beyond the tinted work of the topographer. He has been called the father of water colour art, but the title more properly belongs to John Cozens, his junior by twenty-seven years. John was the son of Alexander Cozens, also an artist, who was said to be the natural son of Peter the Great, and was born in Italy. Though he hardly did more than suggest the colour, he was an artist in the highest sense, and certainly the first painter in

Rise of English Water Colours.

Cozens.

water colour who was penetrated with the sentiment of the *paysagiste*. Indeed, Constable said of him in a moment of expansion that he was the greatest genius that ever touched landscape. He seems to have invented, or at least to have known, a good many of the modern devices, such as washing and abrasion of the surface, and the like. He is best known by his Italian views, painted for Alderman Beckford. Once, and once only, he exhibited at the Royal Academy, and his work drew from Turner a declaration that he had learnt more from it than from any other picture. This was called "A Landscape, with Hannibal on his March in the Alps, Showing to his Army the Fertile Plains of Italy"—a thoroughly Turnerian subject which, unfortunately, has now disappeared. The contemporaries of Cozens, William Payne, a neighbour of Sir Joshua's at Plympton, and John Smith (known as Warwick Smith), introduced further refinements into the practice of water colour. The former had a great name as a teacher, and Gainsborough said of the latter that he was the first water-colourist "who carried his imitation through."

Thomas Girtin.

A still further advance was made by Thomas Girtin, a Londoner, who, though he died in 1802, cut off at the early age of twenty-nine, is much more modern in feeling, displays much greater breadth, spending himself more on mass than outline, and on depth and richness rather than precision of colour. He was a pupil of Dayes, a water-colourist of the old school, for a short time; but his best training seems to have consisted in copying the works of earlier men, such as the Rookers, Hearne, and Cozens, and sketching from Dr. Munro's windows. This took place at the doctor's rooms in the Adelphi, where Girtin had for a fellow-student another Londoner: none other than Joseph Mallord William Turner. This wonderful man there began the study which occupied his life: the perfect rendering of light. His earliest step in this direction was to paint the shadows of their true tint—first at some sacrifice of the lights, but gradually with fuller knowledge came perfect mastery over lighted surfaces as well. It is noteworthy that Turner, the water-colourist, from the beginning to the end of his career, forbore from gaining his effect by the use of body-colour in his pictures (though he employed it freely for

J. M. W. Turner's Water Colour Practice.

memoranda), declaring that its use would ruin water colour art, and destroy its beauty and individuality.

It is always difficult to fix a date for the maturity of a movement, but accepting 1800 as the date at which Turner had completely mastered his system, we may fix that as the year in which the water colour art of England attained to manhood.

Behind the actual pioneers and the immense and original talent of Turner stood a considerable group of artists in water colours, partly their contemporaries in age, partly men whose meridian belongs to a subsequent generation. Discontented with the small, ill-lighted room which the Royal Academy allotted to their works, a section of these *frondeurs* seceded, and in November, 1804, established "The Water Colour Society." The leading spirits in this affair—Hills, Pyne, Shelley, Wells, John Varley, Glover, and W. S. Gilpin—were not quite the first in their profession, and of course Turner was not among them, as he had been already elected an Academician. The Society was limited to twenty-four, and the right of exhibition was confined to members. At first great success attended their exhibition; but their exclusiveness created jealousy among outsiders, with the result that the year 1808 saw the establishment of a rival association. For the time, however, water colour had gone out of fashion. The new association rapidly died of inanition, and the older society found itself in such straits that after a few years a dissolution was agreed to. Not all the members, however, accepted extinction; and a group of a dozen or more, including Barret, Glover, Copley Fielding, and, after a short interval, David Cox and Linnell, started a new exhibition. But the fates were adverse to this also, notwithstanding the high rank of the artists. The year's show was a failure, and the next year's exhibition never took place. This, which, in matter of popularity, probably marks the low tide of water colour, occurred in 1815. Nevertheless, the art was already too firmly established to be seriously affected by the temporary breakdown of the machinery of exhibition. One has only to recall who were at work at the date in question, to be convinced of this. Of the older school, the frugal George Barret and the prolific John Varley were still in their prime. The

The Water Colour Society.

suggestive architectural draughtsman, Samuel Prout, just elected to the society, was then thirty-two, and almost of the same age were Peter de Wint and David Cox, the greatest of them all. Fielding, the master of deep misty distances, was twenty-eight, and William Henry Hunt, to whom no subject came amiss, was three years younger. Obviously our most distinctively national branch of art had not only reached a flourishing stage, but was never in less danger of failing than in 1815.

Sculpture.

Among the sculptors practising in England in the first half of the eighteenth century, though a few English names, like that of Francis Bird, occur, there is only one artist of real distinction—the Frenchman Louis Roubillac of Lyons (p. 90). But when, in 1768, the Academy was founded, Roubillac had been dead for two years, Rysbrack and Scheemakers, his would-be rivals, had fallen into obscurity, and the only sculptors elected original members were, it would appear, Joseph Wilton and Agostino Carlini. Of the latter we know little, except that he executed some tolerable busts, and was the first keeper at the Royal Academy. The second keeper was Wilton, who, though warped by the taste of the time, was an accomplished and independent artist, a good anatomist, and a skilful worker in marble. He had studied under the French sculptor Pigalle, and had resided several years in Italy, and his work seems to reflect a divided aim. He may fairly be gauged by his monument to Wolfe, which himself and his contemporaries regarded as a masterpiece, but which strikes us now as somewhat heavy and confused, exhibiting an unfortunate mixture of figures in relief and in the round. But the opening of the Schools of the Academy, and the fact that the first two keepers were sculptors, gave an undoubted impetus to the art of the modeller. The names of three of the pupils, Nollekens, Banks, and Bacon, sufficiently corroborate this view.

John Bacon.

Bacon, who was born in 1740, five years the junior of Banks and three years younger than Nollekens, came to the Academy from the Chelsea china works, and afterwards modelled groups, figures, and animals for the manufacturers of a kind of pottery called lithodipra. He was a wonderful prize-winner, and out of sixteen public

monuments for which he competed he was successful fifteen times. His works are plentiful at Westminster, his most famous work being Chatham's monument, and his most attractive that of Brigadier Hope. Banks had been apprenticed to a wood-carver, and had studied for a year in the St. Martin's Academy, so that his advantages in point of training were considerable. He was, however, an inferior artist. He attempted many strange subjects; "Armed Neutrality" for one, which he designed for the Empress Catherine, and "The Frenzied Achilles," which never found a purchaser. His gigantic cenotaph to Sir Eyre Coote, with the palm-tree in the centre, is one of the eyesores in Westminster Abbey. He had, however, a certain gift of graceful pathos, and it is said that Queen Charlotte burst into tears at the sight of his monument to Penelope Boothby. He possessed a genuine admiration, not to say yearning, for the antique, but was apt, doubtless, to mistake memory for inspiration. Joseph Nollekens was an artist of a much more masculine character. He, like Chantrey, had a real gift for portraiture, but, in effect, for portraiture alone. His busts are exceedingly actual, if occasionally mannered, and it is by their vigorous realism that he is remembered. He died in 1819 at the age of eighty-one, but he had long abandoned the practice of his profession.

Thomas Banks.

Joseph Nollekens.

The one English sculptor of the century to whom the title of genius may properly be given was John Flaxman. He was born in 1755 at York, and was the son of a cast-maker employed by Roubillac. John was too sickly a child to go to an ordinary school, so that his childhood was passed in his father's workshop, drawing or modelling, or trying to teach himself Latin, and getting by heart classic fables. At twelve his medallion won a prize at the Society of Arts, and at fifteen he became a student at the Royal Academy and carried off the silver medal. At twenty he was engaged by Wedgwood's firm to model classical groups and portrait medallions for their ware. For this he showed more than ordinary aptitude. His skill in dealing with reliefs on a small scale is really phenomenal; but working under such restrictions as to size undoubtedly had a cramping influence on his talent. Even after his seven years' stay

Flaxman.

in Italy, which commenced when he was thirty-two, he never quite threw it off—never grew to be quite at home with life-size representation. His most paying work in Italy was his designs for Homer and Dante, which are not only ingenious, but full of a classical feeling that is almost Greek. He produced few busts and statues, and his emblematic groups and public monuments do not exhibit his talent at its best. His numerous memorial reliefs, of which many cathedrals and churches contain examples, better display his genuine, if limited, gift. Most of them consist of symbolic groups embodying some simple idea, as sorrow, resignation, comfort. In his hands such themes, though treated in the classical spirit, are neither cold nor conventional, and he manages to combine a certain touch of real human pathos with the grace which never deserts him. Almost alone of English sculptors, he has the secret of uniting the rhythmic flow of antique composition with the unaffected pose and gesture of actual life. His talent can, however, be gauged best of all by the collections of his drawings, sketches, and studies in London and Cambridge. Romney was one of his earliest backers; Blake and Stothard were the friends of his adolescence. In 1800 he was elected a full Academician, and appointed Professor of Sculpture in the Academy in 1810. His lectures are valuable and of mark in many ways, and not the least in this—that they show how a passionate classicist can do justice to Gothic art.

H. D. TRAILL. Literature.

It is a common and perhaps a convenient practice to date the reaction against eighteenth century classicism in English poetry from the period 1798–1800. For in the former of those two years appeared the first edition of the "Lyrical Ballads," while the latter witnessed the publication of the second edition of that almost too celebrated volume, accompanied by that certainly too famous preface in which Wordsworth laid down what he conceived to be the true principles of poetic composition. Yet, whether we look at the Reaction from its Romantic or its Naturalist side; whether we regard it as preparing the way for a bolder, franker, more picturesque treatment of human action and passion, or as

The "Lyrical Ballads."

leading poets to seek a closer contact with nature and a simpler and sincerer form of poetic language, neither of these two dates is accurate. Coleridge, whom we regard as the representative of the movement in the former aspect, made no converts to Romanticism by his example as displayed in the "Lyrical Ballads"; nor certainly, either by force of example in the text or of precept in the preface, did Wordsworth succeed in convincing the world that he had rediscovered the true but forgotten speech of the Muse. The justification, however —and it is perhaps a sufficient one for treating the "Lyrical Ballads" as epoch-making—is that both poets had clearly conceived the movement in its twofold character, and did deliberately purpose its initiation when the plan of the volume shaped itself in their minds. Coleridge's account of the matter is at any rate distinct to this effect. In a well-known passage of the "Biographia Literaria," he says:—

> "The thought suggested itself (to which of us I do not recollect) that a series of poems might be composed of two sets. In the one the incidents and the agents were to be in part, at least, supernatural; and the excellence aimed at was to consist in the interesting of the affections by the dramatic truth of such emotions as could naturally accompany such situations, supposing them real. . . . For the second class subjects were to be chosen from ordinary life; the character and incidents were to be such as will be found in every village and its vicinity where there is a meditative and feeling mind to seek after them, or to notice them when they present themselves."

With the omission of the accidental ingredient of the supernatural (obviously only one of many ways of removing "incidents" and "agents" from the sphere of every-day life: which removal alone is of the *essence* of the definition) the second sentence in the above quotation defines the "romantic' *per genus et differentiam.* Generically it differs from realistic forms of poetry by deliberately dealing with incidents which, from supernatural or other causes, are of stronger interest than those of ordinary life, and with character heightened accordingly; specifically it is distinguished from the merely fantastic by its dramatic truth. The last sentence of course contains Wordsworth's theory of the subject matter of poetry, which he was afterwards to supplement in the Preface to the "Lyrical Ballads" with his theory of its language.

The result of the experiment is well known. Coleridge

contributed but two pieces to the joint-stock production, and Wordsworth the remainder—a disproportion so great that "my compositions," says the former poet, "instead of balancing the others, appeared rather an interpolation of heterogeneous matter." His chief contribution, moreover, the immortal "Ancient Mariner," belongs rather to the school of allegorical fantasy than to that of romance, its plot and incidents having hardly enough coherence to give it that "human interest" at which the poet admitted himself to have aimed; while the fragment of "Christabel," his true romantic masterpiece, and the real parent seed of the Romance poetry, was destined by a chance unprecedented in literature to fructify *in manuscript* through its inspiration of another poet who read it in that form years before it appeared in print. As to the famous poetic theory enunciated by Wordsworth two years later, he did not even at the time secure the adhesion of his colleague, by whom, moreover, in the "Biographia Literaria," published seventeen years afterwards, it was with many expressions of affectionate esteem and admiration for its author irreparably demolished.

Wordsworth's Poetic Theory.

The theory itself and the criticism—one of the acutest and most closely reasoned pieces of critical analysis in the language—may here be briefly set forth. Wordsworth's positions were mainly these two: (1) that "the language of poetry is identical with that of prose" (by which he meant not merely that poets may, and must, make large use of ordinary prose language, but that *any* and every substantive, adjective, verb, phrase, or sentence which is of legitimate use in prose is equally suited to poetry); and (2) that, for a number of reasons, of which Coleridge successively demonstrates the futility, the language of rustic life is better suited than any other to serve this twofold purpose. In other words, Poetry and Prose, according to this theory, speak but one tongue, and that the tongue of the peasant. This is in effect the counterpart and supplement of the famous discovery of Monsieur Jourdain. Indeed, the country bumpkin had even greater cause for complacency than the worthy *bourgeois:* since, however agreeable it may have been to the latter to discover that "for more than forty years" he had been without knowing it "talking prose," it should have been a source of still higher

gratification to the former to learn that poetry had been the unsuspected language of his whole life.

Even to the "plain man," however, unassisted by any critical acumen or special study of the subject, the theory must have suggested one obvious question: If prose does not essentially differ from poetry, why be at the trouble of writing poetry instead of prose? Wordsworth, to do him justice, anticipates this inquiry in his preface, and his answer is exquisitely characteristic of his humourless attitude of mind. "Why," he asks, "am I to be condemned if to such description"—that is, to the description of rustic things and persons, expressed in what he holds to be the true poetic tongue—"I have endeavoured to superadd the charm which by the consent of all nations is acknowledged to exist in metrical language?" One thinks of the lines—

His Practice.

> "In distant countries I have been—
> And yet I have not often seen
> A healthy man, a man full grown,
> Weep in the public roads alone;"

and, comparing it with Coleridge's somewhat malicious but perfectly accurate and much more rustically worded paraphrase, "I have been in a many parts far and near, and I don't know that I ever before saw a man crying by himself in the public road—a grown man, I mean, that was neither sick nor hurt," etc. etc., we ask ourselves with amazement where in the name and "by the consent of all nations" the superadded "charm of metrical language" comes in. Even if it could be traced, it would not afford the slightest support to Wordsworth's theory as to the simple rustic diction being the natural language of poetry; because Coleridge's paraphrase, and not Wordsworth's original, is, as the former points out, the *natural* way in which a peasant would express himself, and it differs in mere vocabulary, as *e.g.* in its synonyms for "distant countries," "weep," etc., from the poet's own language.

It is of course evident that in desiring any "superadded charm" at all, Wordsworth gives away his theory with both hands. Once admit that prose language requires, or even only may require, to have something artificially added to it, in order to invest it with the peculiar charm of poetry, and the

Wordsworthian position is surrendered. It follows from this admission that the proper language of poetry is not, and cannot be, either the ordinary talk of this or that class of society as such, or any other arbitrarily selected and dogmatically defined form of expression; but that it is, and must ever be, solely that mode of speech which, whether as regards the choice of words, or their arrangement, or both, is best calculated to heighten the pleasure which the reader derives from the literary embodiment of the writer's idea. Whether the words so chosen and so arranged do or do not heighten this pleasure is a question not of poetic law, but of æsthetic fact; and it is one to which no man's poetry supplies a greater variety of answers than does Wordsworth's. When he says to the leech gatherer: "But where is it you live and what is it you do?" he certainly does not succeed in heightening whatever pleasure we should derive from having the question put in plain prose. When, on the other hand, he compares the leech gatherer's motionless figure at the tarn-side to a cloud

> "That heareth not the loud winds when they call,
> But moveth altogether if it move at all,"

he as certainly does succeed.

Coleridge's Criticisms.

It is unnecessary to follow Coleridge through his elaborate and overwhelming exposure of this singular delusion. For that exposure almost any one of his arguments would singly have sufficed. But his strongest points are: (1) that even if the vocabulary of poetry were identical with that of prose, the variation in the syntactic order of the words under the exigencies of rhyme would create a vital difference between the two forms of speech; and (2) that Wordsworth's own practice stultified his precepts, seeing that he only rises into poetry when he allows himself to use poetic language, while, whenever he deliberately denies himself the use of that language, he sinks into the flattest and baldest prose.

Wordsworth's example, however, redeemed his theories, and Coleridge had no theories to redeem. The latter's influence was therefore the earlier in its operation, while that of the former has been perhaps the greater in the long run. Yet, by a somewhat ironical fate, it has turned out that Coleridge, who concerned himself rather with the matter than the mechanism of poetry, has taken rank as one of the greatest

English masters of poetic form, while Wordsworth, who believed himself to be the inventor of a new, or at any rate the restorer of the true, language of poetry, owes his place in our literature to a force and depth of poetic feeling which even his many defects of form have proved unable to outweigh. The matchless music of the one singer has enriched the note, as the inspired vision of the other has enlarged the outlook, of all English poetry since their day.

The So-called Lake School.

To conceive of them, however, as the immediate founders of a "school" in the sense in which, or in any analogous sense to that in which, a Greek philosopher or an "old master" commonly receives that title, would be a mistake. There was no Lake School in this sense, as was long since pointed out by an eminent writer whose name in the early days of the century was often united with those of the men by whom the school was supposed to have been formed. Wordsworth, as it happened, had a natural connection with the Lake country by birth and marriage, and he by force of the literary sympathy between them attracted Coleridge, who in turn, through the tie of matrimonial affinity, drew Southey thither also. By such accidents of personal or family connections was the Lake colony originally gathered; but contemporary criticism, unaware or incurious of the real facts, imagined them to have been brought together by common views on the subject of literature, especially with regard to the true function of poetry and the true theory of poetic diction. Thus misled, people went on, continues De Quincey, "to find in their writings all the common characteristics which their blunder had presumed, and they incorporated the whole community under the name of the Lake School. Yet Wordsworth and Southey never had one principle in common; their hostility was ever flagrant."

Nevertheless, the accident of their common place of abode was, on the whole, not otherwise than fortunate. If the mistaken impression produced by it did occasional injustice to individuals, it tended indirectly and ultimately to popularise a knowledge of the new poetry and to stimulate curiosity as to the personalities and genius of the men by whom it was being produced. Such familiar expressions as the "Lake School," "the Lakists," "the Lake poetry," did undoubtedly direct public attention to questions of poetic matter and

manner upon which it was very desirable to concentrate it. But, strictly speaking, the so-called school never at any time contained more than the two masters, Wordsworth and Coleridge; for Southey, though an admirable prose-writer, was a poet of far inferior calibre to either, and his poems, once highly considered, have now found their proper level of respectable rhetorical verse; while Lamb, De Quincey, and others, whose names were often associated with the school in the controversies of the day, belonged to it less as adherents of its principles than as admirers of its two great masters.

Moreover, for all doctrinal purposes, either of precept or practice, its two great masters were too quickly reduced to one. Coleridge's "Christabel" wrought its influence even before publication, and though not wide, yet a most potent and memorable influence it was; but the poem itself was not published till 1816, and produced little impression upon the critical, and still less upon the general, public even then. Further, it must be remembered that but a few years after the composition of this poem (that is to say, about 1802–3) Coleridge's poetical powers fell, under the combined influence of ill-health and opium, into almost complete abeyance. He had ripened much more quickly than Wordsworth, but his time of blossoming and fruitage was lamentably short. The elder poet, on the other hand, continued steadily at work for a long series of years. It cannot be said that it was an uninterrupted period of growth with him, or not, at any rate, on all sides of his genius; for sense of style and power of self-criticism were faculties which Wordsworth never acquired.

The "Excursion."

The "Excursion"—his greatest, in the sense of his longest, poem—falls within the period with which we are dealing. It was written in 1814, and may, therefore, be taken to represent the full maturity of the poet's genius; nor is it wanting in passages which do that genius justice. Yet in no poem is Wordsworth's inequality more conspicuous; in none do we so suddenly or so often descend from the empyrean of poetry to the flats of prose; in scarcely any do we find a more constant necessity of reminding ourselves that the mechanical weaver of these commonplaces was also the inspired builder of the great "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality."

It was, as is well known, the unfinished poem of "Christabel," read by him only in manuscript, which gave its first impulse to the romantic poetry of Walter Scott. He had hitherto been known as the author only of some metrical translations from the German and a few short original pieces in verse, though his true feeling for romance had been shown as collector and editor of the Scottish Border Ballads. But in 1805, a casual recitation of "Christabel," heard a year or two before, having "fixed," says Lockhart, "the music of that noble poem in his memory," he was fired with the idea of "throwing the story of Gilpin Horner into somewhat of a similar cadence," and the result was the "Lay of the Last Minstrel." "Marmion" followed in 1808; the "Lady of the Lake" in 1810; and thenceforth Scott continued to publish a romantic poem almost yearly, until the series closed with the "Lord of the Isles" in 1815. Their success was great and well deserved; for though Scott had neither Coleridge's extraordinary musical faculty, nor his dreamy tenderness of sentiment, nor his gift of mystical imagination, there is a spirit and fire in his narrative verse, and a certain masterly breadth in his treatment of nature—as witness the noble opening to the "Lady of the Lake," "The stag at eve had drunk his fill," etc.—which must irresistibly challenge all those who scruple at bestowing the name of poetry on these splendid rhymed romances to enlarge their definitions. Scott's ardour of inspiration had no doubt begun to abate somewhat in 1815, after ten years of active poetic production; but, as is well known, it was the belief, not wholly unfounded, that the earlier romantic poems of Byron threatened to supplant his own in popular favour, which caused him, to his own greater glory and to the imperishable gain of our literature, to exchange poetry for prose.

Scott's Poems.

But the poet who had thus driven him from the field, though destined indeed to surpass him in achievement, had certainly not yet done so; and it is proof rather of a fickleness of affection than of a quickness of appreciation on the part of the public that they should have abandoned the genuine dramatic stuff of "Marmion" and "The Lay" for the stage-heroics of the "Corsair" and the "Giaour." For it must be remembered that it was solely on these brilliant but artificial romances that in

Byron's Early Poems.

the year 1815 the fame of Byron as a serious poet principally rested. The two earlier and vastly inferior cantos of "Childe Harold" had indeed appeared; but they gave little, if any, promise of their two splendid successors. It was not till the period treated of in the next volume that Byron stepped into that place in our poetic literature which, after a short interval of disputed title, the judgment of posterity has now irrevocably confirmed to him.

Shelley's Early Work.

The case of Shelley, our account of whom must also be deferred to a later stage of this work, is somewhat different. Though he was five years younger than Byron and much more than five years later in attaining fame, his genius came far more rapidly to maturity, and at an age when the future author of "Don Juan" and the third and fourth cantos of "Childe Harold" was still content with the crudity and commonplace of the "Hours of Idleness," the future author of the "Prometheus Unbound" and the "Cenci" had already produced "Queen Mab." The faults and immaturities of this singular poem are indeed conspicuous enough. Ridiculed in so far as it was not ignored at the time of its appearance, it has in later times and in some quarters been absurdly overpraised; but, with all its defects and excesses of youth, an impartial criticism can hardly hesitate to pronounce it the most striking and powerful work of imagination, and by far the richest in promise, that has ever sprung from the brain of a poet who had not yet passed his twentieth year. There is at least no denying that in its finer passages we get much more of the real Shelley than we get of the real Byron before 1816, when the elder poet had already attained the age of twenty.

Campbell and Moore.

Among the other and (as we must now perhaps style them, though they would certainly have resented such a designation in their own day) minor poets of this period, the names of Campbell and Moore must not pass without a word of mention. The first of them indeed, if we were to confine our attention to those shorter pieces to which he himself attached the least value, might perhaps make good his claim to a more honourable title. The two battle pieces and the one patriotic ballad of Thomas Campbell—"Ye Mariners of England," "Hohenlinden," and the lines composed in celebration of the naval victory

of Copenhagen—still take rank among the most stirring specimens of the Tyrtæan lyric in our language. They are read and admired in their entirety when of the "Pleasures of Hope" —that smooth and elegant verse exercise in the manner of Goldsmith which so curiously lifted Campbell into youthful fame at a period (1799) when Goldsmith's manner might have been thought to have become hopelessly obsolete—but a few isolated lines survive in memory. After an abstention of nearly ten years from poetic utterances *de longue haleine*, he was in 1809 attracted by the new movement to the field of romance, and the result was "Gertrude of Wyoming," a poem which, though well received, was far from repeating his earlier success. Campbell, in fact, has lived, and will live, by his least ambitious efforts, sharing in that respect the limited and qualified immortality of Moore. Thomas Moore (1779–1852) who, in the earlier years of the present period had acquired a certain vogue by the publication of a volume of elegant but somewhat indecorous amatory poems, entered in 1807 into an arrangement with a music publisher to supply words to a collection of the native melodies of Ireland. No such distinguished success was ever before, or has ever since, been achieved in the not very distinguished art of "writing up to" music. The "Irish Melodies," it is true, show many marks of their conventional origin; they are in a certain sense artificial products, altogether wanting in the freshness and *naïveté*, the epic force and simplicity of the genuine folksong; but they were the work of a man in whom the melancholy charm of his country and of his country's music inspired a feeling so genuine and, indeed, so intense as continually to lift, if it could not consistently maintain, his expression above the level of the commonplace. It is the lack of this emotional sincerity which leaves his more ambitious efforts comparatively cold and lifeless, and has consigned "Lalla Rookh" to an oblivion which the "Irish Melodies" and a few other lyrics of Moore's have escaped.

Prose, 1802–1815.

Considering the remarkable amount and varied character of its literary activity, the short period with which we are dealing is somewhat singularly wanting in specimens of the greater prose. It is necessary to limit this remark to the product itself as distinct from its producers, because between 1802 and 1815 there were men

living and writing who were afterwards to leave a lasting mark upon our prose literature. But they had either not yet reached their maturity, or had hitherto failed to find their real strength. Scott was engaged throughout nearly the whole period in cultivating the muse of metrical romance, and only published "Waverley" in 1815, the year of its close. De Quincey divided the period between Bohemianising in London and lion-hunting at the Lakes. Hazlitt, although a contributor to the periodical press in 1812, had not yet exhibited those powers as a critic in which few, if any, of his contemporaries or successors have approached him. Charles Lamb had desisted from those early and not very fortunate attempts at verse to which he had been impelled by his friendship with and admiration for Coleridge; and after an equally short and still less successful courtship of the dramatic muse, had published only those earlier prose pieces which, while they revealed to the world the admirably sensitive and sympathetic critic of Elizabethan poetry, only partially displayed the quaint and delightful genius of the essayist who, under the name of "Elia," was to make an imperishable addition to the prose classics of the language.

Southey's Prose.

Only one prose writer of the first order was producing works of a corresponding rank. It was during these years that Southey expanded a review-article into the shortest but greatest of his biographies, the "Life of Nelson," a work which, with others by the same author, may fairly be taken as fixing the standard of early nineteenth-century prose. It does this all the more effectively from the very fact that Southey, unlike the two greatest prose writers of the previous generation, was not impelled by any overmastering force of individuality to individualise his style. Writers in whom this force is strong no doubt accomplish the greater things, and leave behind them the more splendid monuments of themselves. But for that very reason they are less representative of their era, and their works less accurately indicate the particular stage of development reached by the literary language of their nation at the period in which they write. Southey's biographies mark the beginnings, and fix the character, of nineteenth-century prose. Less formal in structure and less rhetorical in vocabulary than the prose of the preceding era, it has gained in simplicity and directness,

in artistic compression and reserve. Southey's prose had none of the qualities which impress us in the prose of Gibbon, or which enchant and almost intoxicate us in that of Burke; but we feel, all the same, that neither Burke nor Gibbon could have turned their instrument of language to the purposes of a short biography with such mastery as Southey in the "Life of Nelson" displays in the use of his. Above all, we feel that a race of beings among whom mortal will always be more common than immortal writers have been supplied with an incomparably more useful model for imitation in the prose of Southey than in that of Gibbon or of Burke.

The Literature of Criticism.

If, however, the biographical masterpieces of this eminent writer constitute the only notable additions to our prose literature during this period, its first decennium was marked by two events of lasting importance to our general literary history. For it witnessed what may be fairly called the organisation of criticism as a distinct branch of English letters. Great individual critics, often men of dominating force of intellect and character, had of course flourished before. Dryden in the seventeenth century and Johnson in the eighteenth are notable examples. But they took criticism, so to speak, "in their stride"; they were poets, scholars, historians, moralists essentially, and in the first place; critics only in the second place, and by accident. Above all, the weight which their criticism carried was solely that of their own names. Where those names were not signed or not known, there was no means of replacing the consequent loss of individual influence by any form of corporate authority. It "said nothing," for instance, to anybody that such and such a paper on this or that new book or literary subject had appeared in the "World" or the "Connoisseur." Literary criticism had not yet organised itself, as political and social criticism had long since learned to do. It had never yet provided itself with any authoritative medium of expression in the periodical press—never yet found a voice to which people would listen, because, even though the tone could not always be identified, it was known to proceed from one or other of a band of collaborators all more or less accomplished as writers, and all men of acknowledged competence as critics.

Criticism, however, was to find such a voice in the very year

with which this period commences. In 1802, the *Edinburgh Review* was projected by a small coterie of literary men, united by a general sympathy in the matter of letters and by a common Whiggery in politics. They were all men of distinct, if unequal, ability, most of them men of considerable information, and at least one of them, Brougham, a man of "omniscience." Scott lent the services of his pen to its earlier numbers; Sydney Smith contributed wit in abundance; the future Chancellor wrote untiringly and with extraordinary speed on every conceivable subject; Francis Jeffrey, the first editor, was in many respects heaven-born to the craft; and thus in a few years' time the new literary periodical had become a power in the land. An ill-judged and ungenerous attack in 1809 on the Spanish patriots then endeavouring to make head against the encroachments of Napoleon disgusted and alienated its Tory subscribers, and the result was a secession and the establishment of its rival the *Quarterly*. The new review, which commanded the good-will and active literary assistance of Scott from the first, and soon afterwards enlisted powerful recruits such as Southey, Lockhart, and others, stepped at once into a position of at least equality with the older periodical; and for more than a generation the two reviews together may be said to have played the part of "commissioners to execute" that office of "Lord High Censor of Literature," which had been filled in earlier periods with so much authority by individual men of letters, but which since the death of Johnson had practically ceased to exist.

The "Edinburgh Review."

The "Quarterly Review."

They were of course not more infallible than other Boards of Commissioners known to past or even, it may be, to present history; and it was their misfortune that among the mistakes committed by them were one or two of a monumental character, which have come down to posterity in inseparable association with the names of the men whose genius they failed to recognise. For this they have suffered—as perhaps a still earlier critic may have suffered before them for a similar offence—an excessive penalty. Zoïlus, for all we know, may have been a very competent judge of poetry: it was through his ill-luck in attacking an immortal that he has immortalised

Jeffrey and his Colleagues.

himself in the opposite character. He survives under the undesirable nickname of "Homeromastix" because it was upon the "Iliad" and on the "Odyssey" that he pronounced his sentence of "This will never do." Happily for the critic who slighted Wordsworth, and for the critic who failed to recognise Keats, these failures do not constitute their whole record. They have many other and sounder judgments to refer us to, and it is unfair, though it has been too common, to dwell upon these memorable blunders. Jeffrey, after all, was a critic of no mean ability, as many an acute and impartial appreciation of contemporary literature under his hand exists to prove; and he was seconded, as was Gifford in the *Quarterly*, by a staff of writers whose services in upholding sound literary standards and in exposing the pretensions of literary impostors far outweighed any errors of critical judgment which have ever been brought home to them. That their verdicts were now and then biased by the keen political partisanship which prevailed during the early years of the century, and invaded regions into which politics should never have been allowed to intrude, is undeniable; but this is only to say that the men sometimes failed to rise to the level of their method. To the method itself it is no reproach, and it does not therefore detract from the merits and the claims of the men by whom it was introduced. The fact remains that the two great literary periodicals which were founded in the early years of the present century were the first to provide for the systematic and efficient performance of a work of the highest importance to the interests of English literature; that the chief contributors to them did undoubtedly constitute in a genuine sense of the words a "college of criticism"; and that they created a critical tradition which later generations have been content to follow, and a critical method which their successors have done no more than develop.

G. TOWNSEND WARNER. Manufacture.

The years 1801 to 1815, in contrast to the latter half of the eighteenth century, are not marked by great names or great inventions. Inventions, indeed, were numerous enough, but they were small inventions, improvements on existing

processes. Machinery was applied in all directions, adapted from one trade to another. It became increasingly complex in nature, but it was not novel in principle. The steam engine became familiar, and was used for many new purposes. The towns grew fast; mills sprang up; it was the day of the capitalist and the organiser of labour. The men who had money and business ability applied the inventions of the eighteenth century and made large fortunes. But the time called for alertness and enterprise in business, and no manufacturer was likely to succeed who closed his mind to the new ideas. Whatever the branch of industry the inventions of the past fifty years were being used more and more; the jenny, the water frame, the mule had become almost universal. Kelly had been trying to apply power to the mule, and, although he was not completely successful, he enabled one man to watch two machines. Puddling and rolling were widely used in the iron works, cylinder printing became general. The power-loom and the combing machine were coming into use, though somewhat slowly.

General Use of New Processes.

The power-loom was an unpopular machine with the men, but this is not the true reason of its tardy acceptance. As Cartwright made it, it embodied a magnificent idea, but was a very defective machine. It was clumsy, and it was slow, because it was necessary to stop it continually in order to dress the warp.

Improvements in the Power Loam: Radcliffe.

The credit of overcoming this difficulty must be divided between Johnson, a workman at Stockport, and William Radcliffe, his employer, who found the money for Johnson's experiments. Radcliffe was a public-spirited man, who objected to seeing English cotton twist exported. He himself would not sell to a foreigner, and a great meeting of master spinners was held at Manchester in 1800 to consider what was to be done. The difficulty was to get the cotton yarn made up. From 1770 to 1788, says Radcliffe, "Cotton, cotton, cotton was become the almost universal material for employment"; the hand wheels were thrown into the lumber rooms; the new spinning machinery adopted in its stead. But even still the hand wheel lingered on. Radcliffe instances the Tomlinsons, four or five orphan sisters, the

youngest upwards of forty; they had a complete spinnery, consisting of two pairs of cards and five hand wheels, by which they more than paid the rent of their farm. On this they kept three cows, one horse, and always ploughed a field, and were celebrated for butter and eggs. One of the sisters was still struggling on in 1822. Such establishments were, as a rule, speedily overcome by the competition of machine spinning. Weavers set up everywhere. Old barns, cart-houses, outbuildings of every description, were repaired (windows being broken through the old blank walls) and fitted up for loom shops. New cottages sprang up. Every family brought home 40s., 60s., 80s., 100s., or even 120s. a week. The improvement in the standard of comfort was manifest. The men went to church in good clothes. Every cottage had a clock; plated tea services were common. This was the golden age of cotton. It was impossible to get enough weavers. "There was not a village within thirty miles of Manchester on the Cheshire and Derbyshire side in which some of us were not putting out cotton warps and taking in goods, employing all the weavers of linen and woollen goods who were declining these fabrics as the cotton trade increased." It was under this want of hands and looms that Radcliffe set about his improvements. Johnson was the son of a workman in his shop, who was "more ingenious about his loom than fond of close working." Radcliffe explained to this indolent and ingenious person what was required, and after many experiments the two completed

"a new system of warping, sizing, dressing, drying, winding on to the beam, drawing and twisting in, spinning on cops for the shuttle, inventing shuttles to receive them (all original) and to complete the whole a new loom half the size of the old ones, taking in its cloth by every motion of the lathe."

The process is described by Radcliffe thus:—

"The yarn is first wound from the cop upon bobbins by a winding machine, in which operation it is passed through water to increase its tenacity. The bobbins are then put upon the warping mill, and the web warped from them upon a beam belonging to the dressing frame. From this the warp is wound upon the weaving beam, but in its progress to it passes through a hot dressing of starch. It is then compressed between two rollers to free it from the moisture it had imbibed with the dressing, and drawn over a succession of tin cylinders heated by steam to dry it, during

the whole of this last process being lightly brushed as it moves along, and fanned by rapidly revolving fanners."

This process, which was patented, was much more elaborate than anything hitherto attempted. Further improvements in the power-loom were made by Horrocks, who had his looms made entirely of iron, smaller and more compact than the old ones. His pattern, being rapid and simple, came into general use. In 1813 there were 100 dressing machines, and 2,300 power-looms in use. Even this was only a beginning, for by 1820 there were 14,150, and in 1833 100,000.

The power-loom, although not popular, did not rouse the same violent feelings as did the combing machine. At first the power-loom was principally used for weaving cottons, whereas the combing machine affected wool. Cotton was a juvenile trade which had to fight its way against a good deal of opposition. It had never been used to the indulgence of Parliament. In fact, it had been treated at times with scant favour. But the woollen industry had been the spoilt child of English manufacture, and, as it were, had grown up cross. In the past it had only to raise an outcry to have its wants satisfied. It had been ancient and honourable, peculiarly profitable to the realm, the pet of centuries, fostered by kings and statesmen, much considered by Parliament. As almost all the great inventions in textile industry were first applied to cottons, the woollen makers felt no immediate concern. But the blow of Cartwright's combing machine was severe, for it was not a machine modified from cotton to suit wool; it was peculiarly adapted to wool, and did not affect cotton at all. Hence the bitter antagonism to the machine. As almost all the mechanical processes invented in cotton spinning were capable of being applied, with a little modification, to the woollen industries, it is somewhat remarkable to find the application of them so tardy. By 1800, when the preparation of cotton yarn by hand was almost extinct, the hand-spinning of wool was still common. Hand-spinning went on side by side with machine-spinning for some time, even in this century. This gradual supersession of hand labour by machinery in the wool trade, which contrasts markedly with what happened with cotton, was due to the fact that the woollen industry was

Application of Machinery to Wool.

scattered over the country instead of being localised. When at the time of the Act of Union it was proposed to allow the export of wool to Ireland, petitions against any such permission came from a hundred and thirteen firms in London, from Cornwall, Exeter, Totnes, Tiverton, Welshpool, Frome, Bury St. Edmunds, Huddersfield, Tavistock, Painswick, Rochdale, Huntingdon, Norwich, Somersetshire, Sudbury, Halifax, Gloucester, Bury, Preston, Market Harborough, Witney, Wiveliscombe, Southwark, Bradford, Cirencester, Colne, Burnley, Banbury, Shrewsbury, Leeds, Wakefield, Haworth, Kendal, Addingham, Kidderminster, Keighley, Skipton, Salisbury.* Although many of these are from Yorkshire, yet the variety is remarkable. Cotton was localised in Lancashire and Cheshire, and thus knowledge of new machinery spread fast; moreover, being a younger trade, it was more flexible, and less bound by tradition. The woollen industry was old and comparatively rigid, and, being diffused as it was, imitation had less play. Thus it is difficult to generalise upon the introduction of machinery, for in some places it was received amicably while elsewhere it was the cause of rioting and violence; not only was the hostility local, but it was apparently captious—some machines roused it, while others did not. The dislike of the combing machine has been already mentioned. But carding machines seem to have been fairly received, and were in general use before the end of the century. In 1793 Arthur Young speaks of machines for "unclothing and puffing out wool." In the West Riding hand-spinners took their wool to the "slubbing engine to be scribbled, carded, and slubbed." In 1790 mention is made of mills "for grinding the wool preparatory to carding, by means of which the master manufacturer has as much done for 1½d. as used to be performed for 4½d." The fact is, that there was plenty of employment in spinning, even when the preparatory processes were done by machinery. But machinery did not stop at preparatory processes. By 1791 machine-spinning by the jenny was performed at Barnstaple, Ottery St. Mary, and Kendal. The machines were regarded with suspicion, but it was found that there was still work for the hand-spinner. The machine-spun yarn competed with its rival, but did not at first oust it. Hand-spinners could no longer afford to be idle. They had

* Cunningham: "English Industry and Commerce," vol. ii. p. 459.

to work hard to keep up, and their work was increased by the fact that the machine-spun yarn was finer, and, consequently, spinners being paid by the pound, more had to be done to earn the same money. About 1800 machine-spinning began to become general in the West Riding. This was chiefly due to Benjamin Gott, a great manufacturer, who took the lead in the application of various new machines. Hand-spinning was done at very low rates. In the Eastern counties spinners got 4d. a day, whereas in 1760 they had been earning 7d. and 8d.; but trade was leaving the Eastern counties and wages were naturally low there. At Halifax in 1791 spinners were getting 1s. 3d.; but, as Radcliffe shows, cotton was drawing off all the best spinners from the woollen industries, so that it was often very difficult for woollen manufacturers to get yarn spun at all. The tendency was for inferior spinners only to stick to the woollen and worsted industries; the higher wage to be gained in cotton spinning attracted everyone, and all the best hands had no difficulty in getting employment. Although the pay which the woollen employers gave their spinners was low comparatively with what was earned by cotton spinners, yet it was not cheap on account of the poor quality. In this way Gott, and others following him, found it almost necessary to adapt the spinning machinery to wool. Gott, however, was not content with this, but went further and introduced machinery for dressing and shearing. Both gig-mills and shearing frames called forth bitter opposition. There seemed, indeed, no province that machinery would not invade. The pressure on hand work, at first slight, became severe, and finally grew intolerable. It was under the cumulative effects of one new machine after another that the artisans grew desperate. From 1811 to 1815 there was a great deal of disturbance in the West Riding, men being organised and trained for the destruction of gig-mills. It only needed twenty minutes for a body to assemble, wreck the mills, and disperse. Foster's mill at Horbury was destroyed in this way. A manufacturer named Horsfall was shot near his own house, and three men were executed for the crime, as were fourteen others for attacks on Cartwright's mill. Eight men were hanged at Manchester for similar offences. Even this severity did not put a stop to the spirit of violence which continued to

Riots against Machinery.

show itself here and there throughout the country. No "Golden Age" in wool followed the introduction of machinery, as had been the case in cotton. In the first place, the cotton trade was capable of much greater expansion than the woollen. Although the amount of cloth manufactured increased greatly, the increase was not so great as in the case of cotton. And the "Golden Age" of cotton was due to the fact that the new machinery, not being at first worked by power, gave plenty of employment—weavers, at any rate, were always busy—but when the wool trade travelled over the same road of change and progress, the case was altered. There was not only machinery to reckon with; there was power to work the machinery. Steam power was ready to supply the place of hands; the power-loom supplanted the weaver, and could deal with the great supply of yarn without calling for additional weavers. And further, the country was feeling the pressure of a long war—a war which had, with the Berlin Decrees (p. 605), become industrial. Food was dear, commerce disorganised and fluctuating, and the lot of the working classes thus rendered doubly hard.

Stockings and Lace.

Nottingham was the district where labour troubles were most severe. It was there that Arkwright's yarn had been first applied to the manufacture of stockings. He went into partnership with Jedediah Strutt, who had made a modification in the stocking-frame by which stockings could be knitted with a rib. Strutt's principle was modified and used for other purposes by Morris, Crane, and Else. Another Nottingham industry was lace, and lace machines of some sort were made by Frost, Crane, and Harvey. Dawson, in 1791, made further experiments in the same direction. In the meanwhile the distress in the district became marked. In 1783, stockingers working plain cotton or worsted hose got from 10s. to 12s. a week, but there was a steady drop in wages, and by 1800 wages were only 7s. In 1803 Joseph Heathcoat, then a young man of twenty, set about constructing a machine to make lace—a machine which would do the work of the pillow, the thread, and the multitude of pins. The task was a most difficult one, but Heathcoat persevered. He took out two patents in 1808 and 1809, and his machine, although extremely complicated, was a success.

The first square yard of net made by it sold for £5: the cost of a similar piece now would not exceed 5d. Heathcoat set up a factory in Loughborough and had fifty-five frames in work.

Luddites.

Just at this time, however, the labour disturbances came to a head in the Luddite riots of 1811. Frames had been extremely obnoxious for some time, and the chance freak of Ned Lud (p. 618), gave an impulse to what became very serious riots. Frames were broken throughout Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Leicestershire. The rioters worked at night, and the precaution of special constables and even soldiers was of little use. The streets of Nottingham were placarded with bills offering a reward for the delivery of the mayor dead or alive to the Luddites; the local militia were bribed, a manufacturer shot dead, arms seized, and oaths administered. Finally seven regiments had to be drafted into the district to keep order. In the midst of all this Heathcoat's frames were broken, and he in disgust left Loughborough and set up at Tiverton.

Iron Bridges.

It is unnecessary to follow in detail the application of machinery to the silk and linen trades. Nor is it possible here to say anything of the later progress of the iron trade, which became more and more active as the demand for iron increased. I have already noted the first iron bridge and the first iron vessel (p. 314). The celebrated engineer, Rennie, had a great faith in the use of iron for bridges, but his plans were often too daring for the time. He proposed to construct cast-iron bridges to cross Conway Ferry and the Menai Straits, each in a single span. He began Southwark Bridge in 1815, making the arches of cast-iron, the centre arch of 240 feet span being the largest cast-iron arch that had then been erected. Rennie was also first in using iron gearing for machines. Very soon nothing but iron was used for not only the gear, but also the whole machine, and from this sprang a further development, the making of machines to make machinery. Complicated machinery is used now so commonly and with such confidence that we are apt to forget why it is so easy to use. This confidence in its use is due principally to the knowledge that all the machine is made to a set pattern, and that if any piece breaks it can be replaced by another piece which is sure to fit

because it is constructed with mechanical accuracy. This system of interchangeable parts has done more to spread the use of machinery than anything else. But in 1800 there was no general agreement over such a comparatively simple matter as the pitch of a screw. If a screw of a bolt broke, it was generally necessary to bore out a fresh thread in the nut to fit the new screw; that was simpler than trying to make a screw to fit the existing thread, and the same difficulty applied with even greater force to more complicated parts.

Skilled Mechanics: Bramah and Maudslay.

The task of establishing standard patterns and real accuracy of mechanical work was performed by a succession of remarkable mechanics, the first of whom was Bramah. His chief invention was the hydraulic press (1795), which first showed engineers in hydraulics how to make practical use of a number of small impulses to obtain practically unlimited pressures. His well-known locks were also of very delicate workmanship. One of Bramah's men was Henry Maudslay, whose dexterity as a workman was unrivalled. Maudslay soon left Bramah and set up for himself; his powers were the admiration of all who worked with him. "With an 18-inch file he was grand," was the opinion of one of his men. While with Bramah, Maudslay invented the leather collar of the hydraulic press—a simple device which, forced in by the pressure of the water, prevented any leakage alongside the piston-rod, and yet, when the pressure was taken off, allowed the piston-rod to move freely. He also invented (or re-invented*) the slide-rest, by which lathe tools could be held firmly. "Maudslay's go-cart" enabled lathe work to be done with great accuracy, and was of great use in screw-cutting. Indeed, Maudslay was thus the first to attempt to introduce uniformity in the pitch of screws—a work which was carried further by Clement and completed by Whitworth. He also made a series of forty-four intricate machines to Marc Isambard Brunel's design for making blocks. These were set up in Portsmouth Dockyard, and worked so well that ten men using them could do as much as 110 had done before. But Maudslay's influence in the direction of exact and systematic work was even more important than his inventions, and no better proof of this

* A drawing of the slide-rest is to be found in the French Encyclopédie of 1772; but, according to Smiles, it is unlikely that Maudslay had seen it.

can be offered than that he trained such men as Clement, Murray, Whitworth, Roberts, Nasmyth, and Muir.

Steam Navigation: Symington and Bell.

Like many other good ideas, the idea of applying power in some form to drive boats was very old. In the sixteenth century Blasco de Garay had made experiments in Barcelona Harbour. Savery, Papin, and Jonathan Hulls have been already mentioned (pp. 315, 460). But at the end of the eighteenth century, with the completion of Watt's engine, the plan became practicable. It was worked at in America and in France before 1800, but in neither case was success attained. During the last years of the century, a Scotchman, Miller of Dalswinton (p. 623), was experimenting with paddles turned by hand. Symington worked out for him the application of steam power, and built, in 1788, a small engine of two horse-power, which was fitted to a double boat having the paddles inside, and drove it at five miles an hour. A larger engine at a cost of £250 fitted to a vessel 90 feet long, was less successful. Miller then gave up the idea, but in 1801 Symington got another order from Lord Dundas, and built the *Charlotte Dundas* on an improved principle. The boat was intended for use on the Forth and Clyde Canal, but though it worked well enough, the proprietors disliked the idea and refused to use the boat. The Duke of Bridgewater gave Symington an order for eight similar vessels, but, as he died immediately after, the order was cancelled and Symington brought to a standstill. In the meanwhile, Fulton, who had seen the *Charlotte Dundas*, ordered a marine engine at Soho and, taking it to America, fitted it to the *Clermont*, which ran successfully on the Hudson. In 1813 Henry Bell, of Glasgow, who had been meditating and experimenting off and on since 1786, built the *Comet* of three horse-power, which began to ply regularly on the Clyde. She was regarded with more alarm than admiration, and one skipper of a sailing craft, being overtaken and jeered at by the crew of the *Comet*, cried out, "Get oot of my sicht! I'm just gaun' as it pleases the breath o' the Almichty, and I'll ne'er fash my thumb how fast ye gang wi' your blasted deevil's reek!"

The period treated in this and the preceding two chapters is usually called the Industrial Revolution. In

1740 industry, if not primitive, is at any rate somewhat old-world. In 1815 it is modern. Substantially it is the industry of our own day. It is convenient here to run over the main features of this "Industrial Revolution," and see in what the revolution lay. In the first place, there was an enormous increase in the volume of trade. In 1740 there was no true cotton industry at all (that is to say, all so-called "cottons" were made with a linen warp); the import of cotton for fustians and candlewicks and various purposes was 1,645,031 lbs.; in 1789 it had reached 32,576,023 lbs.; in 1815 it was close on one hundred millions. In 1775 yarn No. 80 cost 42s. the lb. to spin. In 1815 No. 100 (a finer yarn) cost 8d. The sale price of No. 100 in 1786 was 38s.; in 1807 was 6s. 9d. In the woollen industry the figures are not so striking, but they are remarkable enough. In 1771 the import of wool was (in round numbers) 1,800,000 lbs. In 1814 it was 15,700,000 lbs. In 1742 there were milled in Yorkshire 45,000 pieces of broad width and 62,800 narrow. In 1815 the numbers were 330,000 pieces of broad width and 162,000 narrow; and in the time the average length of the piece had more than doubled. The declared value of woollens exported in 1742 was £3,358,000; in 1816 it was £9,387,000. In 1740 there were 17,350 tons of pig-iron made. In 1806 there were 258,206 tons, and in 1825 581,367 tons. In 1740 we exported hardly any iron and imported a good deal. In 1815 we exported 91,000 tons, while between 1792 and 1812 the quantity imported had fallen from 51,000 tons to 24,000 tons. The earthenware business had grown enormously; so also had the linen industry, and, in a less degree, silk. The value of exports rose from £8,197,788 in 1740 to £58,624,550 (official value) in 1815; of imports from £6,703,778 to £32,987,396 (p. 606). The revenue rose from £3,997,000 to £71,900,005 (net); the population from 6,064,000 to something over ten millions.

Features of the Industrial Revolution: Expansion.

But a change in volume, however great, need not justify the term "revolution." Revolution implies change in nature. The change in nature occurred also. In 1740 industry was domestic. Spinning and weaving were done at home in the cottages. The man worked the loom, working what hours he pleased; his wife and children spent their spare time

Changes in System.

spinning yarn. Spinning, in fact, was a by-industry, practised as a subsidiary employment when it was too dark to labour in the fields. There were practically no factories and no manufacturers in the modern sense. "In 1740 the Manchester merchants began to give out warps" (*i.e.* linen) "and raw cotton to the weavers, receiving them back in cloth and paying for the carding, rolling, spinning and weaving." In 1740, save for the fly shuttle (and Dyer in his poem of "The Fleece," published in 1757, had not then heard of it), the loom was as it had been since weaving had begun; spinning was equally mediæval in its arts. There were no machines worked by power in use in the textile trades at all, except that used by Lombe at Derby. In 1815 how complete is the contrast. We have the master and the mill. Men have become "hands" working regular hours. Women and children also have taken their places beside the machinery that is fast superseding all the old methods. In 1740 the law of the land* was that wages in each district should be assessed by Justices of the Peace. In 1725 this was actually done; but so fast had the practice fallen out of mind that in 1795 the Lancashire assessment of 1725 was published as a historical curiosity. It was, further, the law that no one should be a weaver who had not gone through his seven years' apprenticeship, and no weaver was to have more than three apprentices unless he took a journeyman for each extra apprentice. In the course of the eighteenth century these regulations broke down as completely as the system of assessment. Not that the use of apprenticeship disappeared. On the contrary, it remained to become in some cases an engine of oppression. But as weaving could be learnt in a year or so, the textile trades were full of "illegal" weavers, while masters employed any number of apprentices they could get, because after a year or so apprentice labour was exceedingly cheap. As bad times came the artisans turned back to the Elizabethan legislation. They petitioned Parliament to put in force the old clauses about wages and apprentices, and some of the Lancashire masters were not opposed to their plan. But the majority of the House disliked the idea of what seemed to be retrograde; the assessment clauses were repealed in 1813; the apprenticeship

* Under the Act of Apprentices, 1563.

clauses were swept away the year after, and with this all vestiges of mediæval industry vanished.

Industry, then, had changed in nature as well as in volume. It also changed in locality. The migration of ironworks has been already mentioned. But the migration in the textile trades was even more marked. At first weavers were scattered over the country districts. Then, as machine-spinning came into use, the spinners went into factories, and weavers gathered round them, working up the yarn which the master-spinners gave out. Then came the days of power; at first, water-power. Mills clustered on river-sides, and by degrees went further and further up the streams. This meant the destruction of the woollen industry in the flat Eastern counties and wherever water-power could not be had. Employment became scanty, and wages fell and fell, and, in spite of the fall, employment became even more scanty. Those who were wise migrated to the North; those who were without enterprise stayed till the whole industry was killed by Northern competition. The beck-side masters, finding it difficult to get labour, used apprentices more and more. They took children from the workhouses; an excellent plan for the masters, who got labour cheap, and for the parish authorities, who got rid of pauper children—excellent, in short, for everyone but the wretched apprentices set to work in low, unhealthy, ill-ventilated rooms, badly housed, either in the mill or in adjacent barns, underfed, overworked, often half-deformed by undue strain on immature frames, stifled with dust, bad air, and fumes of oil. Apprenticeship is a hard system at any time; one safeguard is that parents are generally one party to the bond. But when Bumble took the place of the parent, then the apprentice was likely to find himself between the upper and nether millstone. It stands to the honour of a manufacturer, Sir Robert Peel, that he was the first to call in the law to the aid of the apprentice. Under Peel's Act (1802) the hours were shortened to twelve (exclusive of meals), night-work was forbidden, some instruction was to be given, and inspectors were appointed to see that the law was kept. This was the first of the Factory Acts, and under it the evils of apprenticeship in a measure disappeared. But by 1802 steam-power was beginning to supersede water-power. Industry drew in again from the

Migration.

streams and settled into manufacturing towns, placed where coal was cheap and labour, especially child labour, likely to be fairly abundant.

Effects.

Those who read history with a view to arraign the past will find much to blame in the Industrial Revolution. They will point to ill-built factories in smoky towns instead of domestic industries practised in the country. They will point to cruelly long hours, to low wages, to the new hostility between master and men. They will say that men found little or no work because the machinery put it into the hands of children, who, growing up without education or home influence, became in their turn hard and brutal. They will show that, if the workers benefited little, the inventors got almost less reward. Kay died abroad, neglected and poor; Hargreaves was driven from his home; Crompton was reduced to bitter misery; Cartwright's invention brought nothing of itself, for the Government gave him what reward he got; Cort died bankrupt; Radcliffe and Horrocks both failed; Wedgwood, Arkwright, Watt, and Heathcoat alone reaped the fruits of their ingenuity. The men who profited were the masters who used the inventions that patents seemed powerless to protect. It is difficult to resist general condemnations of this kind, especially when there is enough truth in particular cases to give an air of verity to the whole. But in mitigation of judgment, it must be remembered that the trouble was aggravated by the long strain of the war, and that it was the very inventions themselves, the development of the new resources, that enabled England to bear the strain and come out victorious at the end. And it is further vain to mourn over what was inevitable. Periods of progress and change are often hard; but the temporary hardships should not be allowed to blind us to the real progress which accompanied them.

J. E. SYMES. The Social Economy.

The Peace of Amiens naturally stimulated British trade. It removed many perils, and threw open to us the markets of those who had lately been our enemies. Our exports rose at once in value from 39·7 millions to 45·1 millions annually. They were paid for largely by the importation

of foreign corn, which pushed down the price of food, to the great advantage of the English poor. Our merchants rushed to take advantage of the new conditions, and when the war was resumed in 1803 many of them were ruined. But this was the result of excessive borrowing and speculation rather than of actual incidents of the war. There was soon a revival. Our complete naval supremacy enabled us to push our trade in all directions, and to monopolise more and more of the carrying trade of the world. Everyone seemed amazed at the progress of British commerce, and Napoleon soon saw that this was one of the most serious obstacles to his plans. He set himself to exclude British goods from Continental markets. But the scheme failed. To deprive the Continent of English manufactures would injure the Continent more than it would injure England.

The War and Trade.

Nevertheless, in the long run, the war could hardly fail to injure industrial progress. It diverted labour and capital alike to unproductive ends. From a patriotic point of view, it might be satisfactory that our enemies and rivals suffered more than we did. But from the point of view of commerce, the injury to foreign nations would react to our own hurt. Trade is ultimately the barter of goods for goods (or services). If foreign nations had no spare commodities to send us, they could not buy our productions.

The Reaction.

Moreover, the renewal of the war revived the old disputes with neutrals (p. 478). As time went on the system of evasions was conducted with more and more skill and boldness. Our enemies, under the cover of neutral flags, were competing with us in all the neutral markets, and made our own commerce dangerous and expensive, in spite of our command of the sea. The neutral vessels had a great advantage over ours in their freedom from the risks of war, and the consequent need of extra insurance. At length, in 1806, we issued an Order-in-Council, declaring a blockade from the Elbe to Brest. There was in reality no effective blockade along much of this coast. Napoleon retorted by the Berlin Decrees (p. 518), in which he accused us of violating the laws of civilised nations. He declared that he

Disputes with Neutrals.

would treat the whole British Isles as under blockade, and would seize all British subjects and goods under his jurisdiction. Both countries proceeded (1807) to more and more extreme measures, setting at naught the generally recognised principles of International Law, and treating neutrals who assisted the enemy by trade with extraordinary severity. A severe blow was thus struck at all trade by sea, and England suffered much. For orderly commerce there was substituted a general system of brute force and cunning. The new policy involved us in new quarrels with neutrals, and ultimately in a war with the United States (p. 521). In spite, however, of all checks, the general progress of our trade may be seen from the following figures:—

Year.	Imports in million £.			Exports.
1795 (Great Britain)* ...	20·1	...	...	22·2
1805 (United Kingdom)	28·5	...	...	38
1815 (do.)	32·9	...	...	51·6

Taxation.

There was urgent need of such an increase in trade if the country was to bear the growing burden of taxation. After the Peace of Amiens the income-tax was repealed; but it was reimposed when hostilities were renewed. There had been much complaint of the "inquisitorial" character of the tax. It was, therefore, now decided to let the returns be split up into distinct schedules, and so avoid requiring a general declaration of total income. Incomes under £60 were to pay no income-tax, and an abatement was allowed for those between £60 and £150. Heavy additional taxes were at the same time (1803) laid on beer, wine, spirits, tea, sugar, and other commodities. In the following year there were more increases. Great stress was laid on the temporary character of all these taxes. Some were to cease with the war; others within six or twelve months from a declaration of peace. As a matter of fact, however, these pledges were not fulfilled. 1805 brought fresh increases. The income-tax was raised to 6½ per cent. Taxes were laid on auctions. The duties on bricks, glass, salt, &c., were augmented. In 1806 the income-tax rose to 10 per cent., and almost all the port duties were increased. The tax on tea was now

* The figures for 1795 include trade between Great Britain and Ireland, but exclude Irish foreign trade. The difference is immaterial for our purpose.

raised to 96 per cent. of its value. The years 1808 and 1809 saw further increases, as well as several fresh taxes. Many of these proved almost unproductive. The Chancellor of the Exchequer complained in 1811: "There was not an article of dress—boots, shoes, leather, breeches, &c.—not an article in the house—locks, keys, bells, &c.—which had not been recommended to him as objects of taxation." He pointed out the miserable returns from the taxes on hats, gloves, and mittens, and announced that these would be given up. Nevertheless, fresh taxes, almost as foolish as those then given up, were imposed in 1812 and 1815. The latter included soap, candles, glass, &c. In spite of all these efforts, there was not a year from 1791 to 1817 in which the national revenue equalled the expenditure. The debt steadily grew. The charge on it grew still more rapidly. In 1790 it was 9·4 millions. In 1815 it was 30·4 millions a year.

But the growth of expenditure and debt were far less alarming than the growth of pauperism. The foundations of the old Poor Law were laid by the Act of Elizabeth. It was modified after the Restoration by the principles of parochial settlement, which led to the creation of close parishes, owned by single landlords, who evicted the poor to prevent their becoming chargeable to the parish. In 1782 what is known as Gilbert's Act (p. 340), attempted to remedy this by grouping parishes for purposes of poor relief. It further enacted that able-bodied paupers were not to be sent to the workhouse. They were to receive what we now call out-door relief. This pernicious system received a great extension a few years later. The magistrates sitting at Speenhamland, in Berkshire, adopted the principle of granting allowances calculated in the following fashion. With wheat at a given price, they settled what was the minimum on which a man with a wife and one child could subsist, and how much each additional child would cost. Whenever the family earnings fell below the estimated minimum, the deficiency was to be made up from the rates. Other places soon followed the Berkshire example, and the "Allowance" system gradually spread over the whole country. Its results were what might have been anticipated. The path to pauperism was made so easy and

Pauperism.

agreeable that a large proportion of the labouring classes drifted along it. No unpleasant questions were asked, and it was natural that men should claim their share as a right. The system further acted as a direct encouragement to improvident marriage and reckless breeding of legitimate and illegitimate children. Finally it transferred a large part of what should have been paid as wages from the employers to other persons, and it lent itself to all sorts of administrative abuses. The poor rates naturally rose rapidly. In the three years 1848-50 the annual charge for pauperism had averaged less than £690,000. In the three years from 1783 to 1785 it averaged nearly two millions. In 1812 it had reached the gigantic figure of £6,656,105. The increase of population was also stimulated. The census of 1801 showed an increase of 11 per cent.; 1811 showed a further increase of 14 per cent.; 1821 a further increase of 21 per cent., being the largest increase for any decennium for which we have figures.

Currency.

The state of the currency and of the par of exchange with foreign countries aggravated the troubles and difficulties of the later years of the war. We have seen that since 1797 England had had an inconvertible currency (p. 479). This tended to produce a rise in prices, an unfavourable foreign exchange, and a premium on gold. The extent of the evil would depend largely on the extent of the issues of paper, and amid the rapid fluctuations in prices and credit it was almost impossible to avoid over-issues. In 1811 the famous Report of the Bullion Committee of the House of Commons appeared, proving conclusively that there had been serious over-issues of bank-notes consequent on the restriction of cash payments. The Committee, therefore, urged that within the next two years cash payments should be resumed. But, after four nights' debate, the House not only rejected this proposal, but actually committed itself to the absurd doctrine that our paper money was not depreciated, though, as a matter of fact, the price of gold in terms of bank-notes had risen from £3 17s. 10½d. per oz. in 1800 to £4 10s. in 1810—a depreciation of over 13 per cent.

In the years following 1808 our foreign trade had become a sort of gambling. No one could guess what Napoleon's next step would be, nor how it would affect prices. When

he occupied Spain the price of Spanish wool was increased by 250 per cent. Italian silk, American tobacco, and cotton, in fact, most kinds of imports fluctuated similarly through the incidents or apprehensions of war. Thus, when the Spanish colonies in South America became practically independent, vast markets were suddenly thrown open to our traders. A speculative frenzy followed. The Bank of England's loans on discount rushed up to over 15 millions in 1809, and over 20 millions in 1810, and in many cases the credit was given to persons who could offer no substantial security. Country banks multiplied, and lent still more freely. The number of such banks had been 270 in 1797. In 1810 it was 721, and the loans on discount of these banks were estimated at 30 millions. Then came the crash, and the contraction both of credit and of trade. Our imports in 1810 were valued at 39 millions. In 1811 they had fallen to 26 millions. Our exports similarly fell in a year from 48 to 32 millions. There were many bankruptcies, and the Government had to intervene, and authorise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to issue six millions in Exchequer Bills. But before the full effects of the crash had been felt there was a brisk revival. Napoleon had declared war on Russia, and soon the Russian and North German ports were thrown open to our trade. Once more there were fortunes made, immense speculation and over-trading. Our exports jumped up to 41 millions in 1812, and the prices of the kind of goods that were being exported rose enormously in the home markets. On the other hand, the splendid harvest pushed down the price of wheat from 155s. per quarter in August, 1812, to 68s. in July, 1813. Then came the crash of 1814, and for three years there was a series of failures. Eighty-nine bankers were reduced to bankruptcy; and ruin and misery spread in all directions.

Crises of 1811-14.

The doctrines of Adam Smith and Malthus continued to exercise a great influence on the more intelligent and thoughtful classes. But now the third of the great founders of the English school of Political Economy had come into the field. Ricardo was a Jew by blood, and had from his fifteenth year been mixed up with Stock Exchange transactions. Born in 1772, he

Economic Theory.

was just entering manhood when the French revolutionary Government made its audacious experiments in inconvertible paper money. Then followed the series of financial crises from 1793 to 1814, the restriction of cash payments in England, the amazing fluctuations in the foreign exchanges, the rise and fall, and rise again of the premium on gold, the fortunes made and lost on the Stock Exchange. The acute intellect of Ricardo analysed all these movements. He made a fortune, but he was more interested in intellectual than in financial speculation, and he had the advantage of being able to test his theories, as he built them up, by a series of observations. For the whole world seemed to be turned into a crucible for economic experiments. The result was that he obtained such a grasp of the principles that underlie many questions of currency, foreign trade, and exchanges as no previous writer had even approximately reached. The masterly report of the Bullion Committee was founded on Ricardo's teaching, and especially on his pamphlet "The High Price of Bullion a Proof of the Depreciation of Bank Notes" (1809), and his defence of that Report in 1811 was the soundest contribution made to the great controversy which grew out of its publication. Then he turned to other branches of economics, in which he was equally original, but less successful. He had lived through the industrial revolution, and he now applied to the analysis of the new system of agriculture, manufacture, and commerce, the same great powers which he had applied to the banking and Stock Exchange questions. But he did not sufficiently realise that men and women are not mere instruments of exchange. His theories of value, of wages, and of rent were brilliant deductions from the assumption of absolutely free competition, of a universal, enlightened, and unqualified desire to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. But the attempt to treat these theories as representing, or even approximating, to the facts of industrial life, led many later writers into absurdities and exaggerations, and greatly delayed the progress of sound economic theory. Individualists and Socialists were alike led astray.

In attempting to summarise the industrial history of England during the period dealt with in this chapter we are met by exceptional difficulties. The war (with all its varia-

tions of alliances and policies, of opened and closed markets), the rapid and constant changes of industrial processes in agriculture, manufacture, and commerce, the disturbing influences of the old Poor-law and the new paper currency, combine to conceal the general tendencies under temporary fluctuations. Some facts, however, stand out very conspicuously.

Economic Summary.

The first of these is the very rapid progress of population. The census of 1801 showed that Great Britain had then a population of 9·8 millions. In 1821 this had risen to 14·3 millions. There had been nothing like this increase in all our earlier history. In fact, during the five hundred years from 1300 to 1800 the total increase was far less than (probably not one-half of) the increase in these twenty years (1801–21). Equally remarkable was the change in the distribution of the population. In the same twenty years, while the gross population rose by about thirty per cent., London increased by about forty per cent. But if we take Liverpool, Manchester (with Salford), Glasgow, and Bradford we find an increase of nearly seventy-five per cent. This illustrates the fact that the population was growing far more rapidly in the towns than in the country districts, and that of the towns it was the manufacturing places of the North and the ports of the North-West which were increasing most rapidly. The growth of the big towns was not more remarkable than that of manufacturing and mining villages, of a character hitherto unknown in England.

Population.

The increase in the national wealth was probably somewhat less rapid than that in the population. The value of taxable income from lands, houses, etc., was estimated at forty-five million pounds in 1798, and at sixty millions in 1815. Now, considering that the war, the growth of population, and the improvements in manufacture and carriage all tended to augment rents, it seems not probable that other branches of the national income had increased quite so rapidly; and the very defective statistics and other evidence that are available seem to point to the same conclusion. Such increase as there was, was also far more heavily burdened. We have already seen how rapidly the charges for the relief of pauperism and for the

Wealth.

interest on the National Debt were growing (p. 607). On the other side we have to put the increase of foreign trade (p. 606). The tonnage of shipping belonging to Great Britain and Ireland had risen from 1,453 tons in 1793 to 1,985 tons in 1803, and to 2,349 tons in 1813. This gives an increase of over sixty-two per cent. for twenty years, *i.e.* considerably more than the increase in the population.

Prices.

Turning next to prices, we have already noticed the extraordinary fluctuations during the war period. In wheat, for instance, we find the average price (per imperial quarter) was £3 4s. in the years 1793 to 1799. It then rose to £5 16s. 8d. in the years 1800 and 1801. It fell to £3 13s. 8d. on an average in the years 1802 to 1808. It rose again to £5 7s. in the years 1809 to 1813, and fell to £3 12s. 9d. in the years 1814 to 1816. As for other prices, the fluctuations in forty typical commodities have been combined by Mr. Jevons with the following results:—Taking 100 to represent their joint prices in 1783, they were at 98 in 1793, at 128 in 1796, down to 110 in 1797, up to 142 in 1800; then, after a series of very rapid fluctuations, they reached a maximum of 151 in 1809, and afterwards fell with moderate steadiness till 1816, when they stood at about 92.* It will, therefore, be seen that the statement that war raised prices has to be cautiously interpreted. Excluding wheat, it would be more accurate to say that, while the general level of prices was somewhat higher during the war than in the preceding years, there were extraordinary fluctuations of upward and downward tendencies, and that while the increase never exceeded fifty per cent., it was sometimes, as in 1797, not more than ten per cent.

Wages.

It is impossible to get any satisfactory statistics of wages during this period. But it is probable that on the whole wages rose about as much as the average prices of all commodities, excepting wheat. This was, of course, a most important exception, and accounts for the intense distress at times when the harvest had been poor. It has also to be remembered that the very frequent financial panics were followed by periods when employment was scarce. Many skilled labourers were displaced, or

* For details see the "Journal of the Statistical Society," xxviii. 314.

reduced to the level of the unskilled, by the constant inventions and the fresh applications of machinery and steam power. But, in the more prosperous years of the war, the mass of the people were probably somewhat better off than in the preceding years of peace.

THE enthusiasm for the peace was unbounded, for it meant provisions at normal prices. Every window in London was illuminated with a wooden triangle stuck with tallow candles or with coloured oil lamps on a black board arranged to spell a large "Peace." Boulton and Watt's premises at Birmingham were illuminated with gas (p. 463). The mail coaches started from the Post Office dressed with laurels and carrying large labels "Peace with France." The rumour that peace was signed ran ahead of them, and crowds lined the London roads awaiting the arrival of the coach to have the news confirmed. There was a day of general thanksgiving and a grand royal procession through London. Only one disagreeable incident occurred. The French Minister's illumination was "G. R.," and "Concord." The crown over the G. R. was unfortunately missing, and the crowd, reading "Conquered" for "Concord," began a riot which was only stopped by the hasty addition of the crown and the substitution of "Amity" for the obnoxious word.

M. BATESON. The State of Society: The Peace.

The old dread of an English revolution was not quite over, and the discovery of Colonel Despard's plot seemed to convince the anxious that their fears were well founded. He had established a Society for the Extension of Liberty and had plotted the death of the king and the seizure of public buildings. Lord Nelson was called as a witness to Despard's loyalty, but he was hanged with six accomplices out of forty-six who had been captured. Despard's last words were that the Ministers hanged him because he was a friend of liberty, and some of the crowd cheered. But this was the last plot of the kind. It soon became evident that whatever form of republicanism had taken root in England, it was not French republicanism.

The last of Jacobin Sedition.

As soon as peace was declared the English, so long cut off from foreign travel, crowded to Paris to see the art treasures

which Napoleon had brought from Italy. So complete had been their isolation from continental intercourse during the first period of the war that many writers express the sensation of complete estrangement which overcame them when they again visited France. Except through the refugees who had poured over at the time of the revolution, the English at home had had no opportunity for social intercourse with foreigners. Some, indeed, had formed close ties of friendship with the fugitives, some had married fugitives and were now anxious to visit the country of their adoption. In 1792 there were said to be 40,000 French emigrants in England, many of them distinguished members of the best French society. It was at Juniper Hall in Surrey that Fanny Burney met Madame de Stael, de Talleyrand, de Narbonne, and her future husband General d'Arblay. General and Madame d'Arblay were among the first to leave.

Foreign Travel.

But the peace had lasted only a year when war was again declared, and this time there was no peace party to be found in England. A Patriotic Fund was started and £12,000 was subscribed at once. The merchants, underwriters, and subscribers at Lloyds' made a general subscription for the encouragement and relief of those who engaged in the defence of their country. Four hundred thousand men enrolled as volunteers, providing their own uniforms and receiving no pay. The English popular attitude towards France and towards the Government's war policy had undergone a marked change. In the first period of the war it was generally felt that England was fighting against an "armed doctrine," now she was fighting for her own existence. To the common people doctrine, whether republican or constitutional, was neither here nor there; war for philosophical principles could not excite their enthusiasm when their own great want was bread. But when the war was against Napoleon, against a would-be invader, famine was made light of and not a voice was raised for peace. The wild alarm which had seized the best-informed, the upper and middle classes, lest revolutionary doctrine should take hold in England was changed to an alarm which affected all classes, but was most strongly felt among the poorest and least well informed.

War Renewed.

In October, 1804, Napoleon was preparing to invade England, and huge patriotic handbills called upon all English-

men to arm in defence of their country. In squibs and broadsides against Bonaparte everything was said that could excite popular feeling against him. He was a Mahometan who had poisoned his sick at Jaffa, he had incited his hell hounds to execute his vengeance on England by promising to permit anything. "He promises to enrich his soldiers with our property, to glut their lust with our wives and daughters." The clergy preached on defence, the poets wrote patriotic ballads. Every county had meetings to organise defence. There were general fast-days solemnly kept, and used by the volunteers for drill. Every male housekeeper rated at £8 a year or over was to be sworn in as a constable, unless he were already a volunteer or physically disqualified. The job-masters offered their horses, Pickford's and other large firms offered their waggons for transport. Pitt, as Lord Warden, headed 3,000 volunteers and intended to take the field. Wilberforce writes, "his spirit will lead him to be foremost in the battle." On October 26th, 1803, George III. reviewed the Volunteer Corps of London, numbering 12,400 men; seven of his sons rode on horseback at his side. Lord Eldon calls it "the finest sight I ever beheld." The old king meant to head the army, and arranged that the queen and princesses should take refuge with the Bishop of Worcester; a servant and furniture was to be sent with them that their arrival might not inconvenience the bishop. The treasure from the bank was to be removed to Worcester Cathedral in thirty waggons escorted by volunteers, the artillery and stores from Woolwich were to be moved to the Midlands by the Grand Junction Canal. Elaborate arrangements were made for signalling the approach of the enemy by beacons. The press was to publish no accounts of the king's troops or of the enemy except by authority of the Secretary of State, who twice a day was to give an official report. The spy-craze raged; tourist excursions were impossible. Arms and transports were very deficient, and great dissatisfaction was felt with all government arrangements, but the prevailing feeling of intense discouragement and alarm made every individual certain that the fate of the country depended on his personal exertions. Party suspicions were almost forgotten, and Pittites were willing to let Foxites arrange the removal of women and children to places of safety

The Threatened Invasion.

provided that the more responsible duties of actual defence were left in their own hands.

Arrest of British Subjects Abroad.

At the end of 1805 the camp at Boulogne was broken up and the scare was over. But the feeling of bitterness remained, and was increased when, in 1806, by the Berlin decrees, all British subjects wherever found were declared prisoners of war. As an act of retaliation against the English seizure of prizes before the open declaration of war, Napoleon had placed under arrest all English travellers and residents in France, between the ages of eighteen and sixty. This made about 11,000 persons captive, and about 1,300 were taken in Holland. Many were the strange domestic tragedies which this proceeding caused, and the story of the lives of English prisoners at Doullens, near Amiens, Lille and Valenciennes has not yet been fully told. In England there were 25,000 French prisoners kept chiefly at Plymouth, Portsmouth, Norman Cross near Peterborough, Liverpool, and Chatham. They were half starved and miserably provided for, and many traditions have been handed down of their skill in making baskets and toys out of odds and ends, by the sale of which they hoped to make a livelihood. They were set to no regular labour, and were allowed out till dark under parole, provided they did not wander more than a mile from the town where they were domiciled. For more than ten years it was only through these prisoners that French and English society came in contact.

Trade Agitations.

No further doubts were felt as to the duty of the Government to continue the war, but the popular sympathy with the war policy was not adequate to silence all political and trade agitations. The last were by far the most formidable. The trade unionists desired to see the apprenticeship statute, 5 Eliz. c. 4, modernised, and extended to the new industries, which had arisen since that statute was enacted and this escaped its rules. The masters opposed the Acts and sought their repeal, for the rule of seven years' apprenticeship prevented them from getting cheap mill hands to supply sudden demands, and made it possible for the employed to organise and bring strong pressure to bear on the employer. In obedience to the masters' demands the Government began by suspending the Elizabethan statute, at first for one year,

then annually; in 1810 the code was repealed for the woollen trade, and in 1814 for all trades. The cloth workers and weavers, in defiance of the Acts of 1799 and 1800 against combinations, formed "institutions" and spent between ten and twelve thousand pounds on petitions against the suspension. The manufacturers on their part formed similarly illegal combinations against the "institutions." The Act against combinations was not very stringently enforced against the unions of either masters or men, partly owing to the inefficiency of the police and partly owing to the ignorance on the part of the Government of the issues which were at stake.

In 1805 an extensive association was formed by the framework knitters of Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, and Derby to prosecute men who were following the business without a legal apprenticeship. They hoped to use their powers as a chartered company to this end, but they lost their case, and it was decided that in their right to choose wardens, etc., and to regulate the internal government of the company, the power to enforce apprenticeship was not included.

The cotton trade and the calico printers were not affected by the suspension of the statutes, for they had never come under their influence, but the demands of the workers in these trades were similar in character. They desired apprenticeship rules to limit the number of workers, and a minimum legal wage. During the eighteenth century their wages had been fixed approximately by the "statement list of prices," but the practice of publishing these lists had been allowed to lapse, and the workers now sought to recover them. The silk weavers had worked without disturbance since the Spitalfields Acts had ordered the publication of price lists.

In 1802 Sheridan's Bill, framed on the report of a committee of the House of Commons, which advocated measures of relief for calico printers, did not get a second reading, and the calico printers' union revived.

As the unions wanted legislation they did not at first attempt to gain their ends by strikes. But it gradually became clear that Parliament had accepted the theory then held by the political economists that labour ought to obey the law of supply and demand like other commodities. Then the unions attempted to raise wages by means of strikes. A serious strike was organised among the cotton-

spinners of Lancashire in 1808. In that year a Bill had been brought in proposing that a minimum rate of wages should be fixed to relieve the extreme sufferings of the operators. The masters declared that they were suffering more than the men through the fluctuations of the cotton trade during the war; the Bill was withdrawn, and the "minimum rate" was declared impracticable and false in principle. The spinners struck work, and 60,000 looms stopped. The men demanded a rise of 33⅓ per cent., the masters offered a rise of 20 per cent. The men refused the offer. At Rochdale the weavers forced the gaol and released the prisoners, but the strike was futile, probably owing to insufficient organisation.

Sufferings.

The war went on, wages went on falling and prices rising. The poor weavers of Hamilton, in Lanarkshire, refusing to eat the bread of charity, would not take the money raised to relieve their distress without earning it, and they set themselves to earn it by making a footpath from Hamilton to Bothwell Bridge. "They little knew," says Miss Martineau, "how they had thus beautified that footpath to many that should come after them."

The Luddites.

In 1811 many Nottingham hosiers had to dismiss workmen, for the newly invented frames worked so rapidly that the market was overstocked. The Luddite Riots began (p. 598). When frames were broken it was said Ned Lud had been there. Sutton, on the authority of Blackner, a leading Nottingham democrat likely to possess authentic information, says that Ned Ludlam was an ignorant youth, who, when ordered by his father, a framework knitter, to square his needles, took a hammer and beat them into a heap. Another version is that Ned Lud was an imbecile boy who broke two stocking frames in a passion. The Luddites not only smashed frames but attacked the millers and corn dealers in their desire for bread. They were joined by the lace makers, who smashed the new machines for making lace. An Act of Parliament made it a capital offence to destroy any kind of machinery used in manufactures, and in 1812 seventeen men were hanged together in York. By that time 624 stocking frames had been broken. The sympathy of the populace in the excited districts made it difficult to capture offenders. The spirit spread to the woollen trades and to the cotton trades. Mills were burned down; the militia depôts

were stormed and the arms used by the mob. Then murders followed; churches and houses were stripped of lead to make bullets. The outrages recurred night after night, all owners of machinery lived in a state of siege.

In 1812, 40,000 cotton weavers went on strike, and the whole strike committee was arrested for the crime of combination. In 1813 there was a cessation of violent rioting partly owing to a fall in prices; in 1814 it began again owing to the depression of trade, due to the disturbed state of credit. Lord Sidmouth, as Home Secretary, took in hand the suppression of riots, and from this time on he knew no peace.

There were other popular stirs in the period, but as compared with the industrial agitation they appear somewhat frivolous. The democratic party gained in zeal if not in discretion when Cobbett began to fight in their cause in 1804. He was able to sow his ideas far and wide, and the seeds did not fall on stony ground. As yet, however, the reforming movements had made but little way. The most important agitation of the period was the ludicrous scene in which Sir Francis Burdett played a leading part (1810). The agitation began when it was proposed to close the Strangers' Gallery during the discussion of the Walcheren expedition. The proposal was popularly considered an infringement of the liberty of the press. A debating society, called the British Forum, printed notices of a meeting in which a vote of censure on the government was to be moved. The House of Commons summoned the printer and ordered his committal to Newgate for breach of parliamentary privilege. Sir F. Burdett questioned the proceeding in parliament, but got only thirteen votes. He then wrote a letter to his constituents "denying the right of the House of Commons to imprison the people of England." Cobbett printed the letter in his *Political Register*. The House pronounced the letter libellous, declared the writer guilty of a breach of privilege, and the Speaker ordered the Sergeant-at-Arms to execute a warrant for Burdett's committal to the Tower. When the time came for the Sergeant to execute the warrant he found Burdett's house in Piccadilly barricaded and guarded by the mob. The Sergeant repeatedly knocked at the door and got no answer. The Speaker sought legal opinions on the validity of his warrant

Sir Francis Burdett.

before proceeding to break doors open. Lord Eldon could give no advice. For two days and nights the mob kept the streets, dispersing only for a short time when the Riot Act was read. Troops were summoned from all parts, and at length the Sergeant, under the protection of the Lifeguards, forced the kitchen door in the area and found Sir Francis appropriately reading Magna Charta to his little boy. He was removed to the Tower, and the soldiers were ordered to charge the mob and fire. The prisoner brought actions against the Speaker and Sergeant, and after some discussion it was decided that their position did not prevent them from pleading in the Law Courts. There their action was upheld, and Burdett was released on the prorogation of Parliament. To the indignation of the assembled crowd he did not appear for the ovation which had been carefully prepared for him, but left the Tower quietly by water. This act was ascribed to cowardice, not modesty, and his popularity greatly diminished. But though the affair ended in apparent fiasco, the House was from that time less prompt to push its claim to repress free public speech.

The O. P. Riots.

The power of the London mob to gain even frivolous ends was seen at the time of the O. P. Riots of 1809, when after months of disturbance the old prices were restored at the new Covent Garden Theatre. A trial was brought about by Mr. Clifford, a barrister, who was charged with inciting to riot because he appeared at the theatre with the letters O. P. in his hat. In defiance of the judge's charge the jury acquitted him. Kemble gave way in the face of this hostile verdict, and the Londoners won.

National Undertakings.

Though there were many reasons why the period could not fail to be one of gloom, signs were not wanting that the energies and resources of the country were nowise exhausted. Large public works were made possible by the great development of engineering (p. 598). The lost art of road-making was recovered; knowledge and invention made it possible to build aqueducts, bridges, lighthouses, docks, and sea-walls, where former generations had found them impossible.

Roads.

Thomas Telford of Eskdale, a stone-mason's apprentice, whose father was a shepherd, had been steadily rising into fame. He had made the Ellesmere

Canal to join the Mersey, Dee, and Severn, had built aqueducts and used iron bridges as County Surveyor for Salop, and in 1802 he was instructed to begin a vast scheme of Scotch roads. In eighteen years he had opened 920 miles of good road with 1,200 bridges. Telford's roads required much labour and care in the making; the bottom course of freestone was set by hand and the spaces packed by hand, a drain was set across at every hundred yards, and on this course was set a top course of small broken whinstones, and a binding of one inch of gravel. Hitherto roads had been made as a rule of round flints and gravel, which the heavy waggons with their wide wheels were expected gradually to consolidate. But they failed to do this, and disturbed the loose substance of the road, making deep ruts. In 1815 Macadam ordered, instead of unbroken flints, angular granite fragments, and by this means and by careful attention during the process of consolidation he easily secured a good surface (p. 624).

London.

The eighteenth century had supplied London with two new bridges, Westminster, 1750, and Blackfriars, 1769. In 1810 Rennie began the Strand Bridge, now Waterloo Bridge, in 1815 he began Southwark Bridge. The Thames was ceasing to be the citizen's "silent way." Sir Francis Burdett elected to do an unusual thing when he left the Tower by water. The main streets were greatly improved for foot passengers; there were raised pavements along which streamed a continual line of passengers, those going and those coming keeping to the left. The roads were crossed by raised causeways of picked stones, very convenient for passengers, but bad for carriages. The side-streets paved with "kidney-stones" were unpleasant for those driving and walking. In 1810 gas-lighting (p. 463) first became general in the streets.

London Manners.

Simond, a French American, visiting England in 1810–11, records that the pastrycook shops at the middle of the day are "full of decent persons of both sexes, but mostly men, taking a slight repast of buns, tarts, etc., and a glass of whey, the whole meal costing 6d. or 8d." Nobody is stirring in the streets, he says, before ten. The fashionable world gives signs of life at three or four, from six to eight dinner is going forward. The rout was already called an "At Home;" nobody sits, there is no

conversation, no cards, no music, only elbowing, turning and winding from room to room, then escape to the hall door, and the same proceeding at the next "At Home." More time is spent waiting in the queue of carriages and on the threshold waiting for the carriage than inside the house. Lectures at the Royal Institution were the fashion; half the audience consisted of ladies "timidly taking notes." Concerning a society so like our own it would be out of place to moralise. Only in manners at table it would appear that some slight change has taken place. A dinner for ten or twelve persons consisted of two courses and dessert. Mr. Simond's first course was soup, fish, roast and boiled meat, and vegetables, spinach and bacon, all served together; the second course was a ragout, game, celery, macaroni, cream and pastry. Dessert was served separately. This menu was somewhat old-fashioned, dishes "were beginning to be served hot and hot." The wines were Madeira, sherry, claret, Burgundy, and champagne, small beer or sparkling ale "in high-shaped glasses like champagne glasses." "Water acidulated by the carbonic acid gas" was being used, and a few drank wine and water mixed. One custom Simond found "not consistent with the delicacy the English pride themselves upon." Bowls of coloured glass are placed before each person at the end of dinner, and all, women as well as men, stoop over it, sucking up some of the water, rinsing the mouth, and swilling it out again. Smollett, sixty years before, says of the French, "they are utter strangers to what we call common decency," *but* each has his own cup, and all do not drink from one tankard, nor can any custom be more beastly than that of using "water-glasses." With the water-glass, the tankard and the two-pronged fork were still in general use in England.

J. COLVILLE. Scotland: Trade.

Glasgow was the pioneer in the oversea trade, but not till 1718 had she a ship crossing the Atlantic that was owned in the city. Her West Indian trade on a large scale dates from 1732, when merchants arranged to supply the planters' wants and sell their crops on commission. This was the foundation of the tobacco trade which, till the American war drove it into new channels, brought more than half the total import of the weed to Glasgow. By this time the city had

correspondents in every port from Leghorn to Bremen. The outgoing cargoes were disposed of by youthful agents among the planters, thus fostering home industries, and diffusing Scottish intelligence and energy throughout the colonies. The effect on the prosperity of the city was very great. "Provost Cochrane," says Smollett in "Humphrey Clinker," "had ships on every sea." Glassford, during the Seven Years' War, owned twenty-five ships and traded for half a million. Their fortunes rivalled those of the manufacturers, one of whom died in 1819 worth £300,000, all made in the muslin trade. Brave efforts were made to find new business after the collapse of tobacco. In 1787 the first commission house was opened in London for Glasgow stuffs, and soon after a system of public sales there was inaugurated. Before this even Dundee sold her ducts through London factors, but the merchants had to lie two years out of their money. The Clyde, a fine salmon stream, but subject to violent floods and uncontrollable tides, could not long accommodate the growing trade. Removing their mediæval harbour from Dumbarton, the citizens converted the poor village of Newark on the opposite shore into the busy Port Glasgow, and here constructed one of the earliest graving docks. But the citizens were still far from their true harbour of the Broomielaw. Smeaton reported on the river in 1755, about which time the whole Clyde shipping numbered only sixty-seven vessels, but nothing was done till Golbourn, of Chester, set to work. By jetties to aid the scour of the stream and rude dredging, he got ships drawing six and a half feet up to the city in 1775. To this only three feet were added by 1816. In 1805 a ship of 150 tons discharged a cargo from Lisbon in the heart of the city. Along with the deepening of the river the national undertaking of the Forth and Clyde Canal was begun in 1768 (p. 325), and completed from sea to sea in 1790. The success of this and the contemporary English schemes created quite a rage for canal projects, few of which were ever heard of again. A far more notable step was the rise of steam-navigation, the pioneer in which was Patrick Miller, a Glasgow man and brother to Lord-President Glenlee. He contrived propulsion by paddles worked by hand, but one Taylor, tutor in his family—he was then laird of Dalswinton and Burns's Nithsdale landlord—suggested

Navigation.

the application of Watt's novel invention to the plan, while Taylor's friend, Symington, a Leadhills mechanic, worked out the designs. The first attempt, on a large pond at Dalswinton, October, 1788, was fairly successful. A large ship, made at Carron, was tried in the canal there (1789) with more success. In 1803 Symington's *Charlotte Dundas* actually towed barges on the canal, but was laid aside from fear of injury to the banks. Here this vessel was studied by the American, Fulton, leading to his success on the Hudson (1807), while Taylor communicated his experience to his friend, Henry Bell, who launched the *Comet* on the Clyde in 1812. Fulton's father had emigrated from his native Dumfriesshire. These events developed a new spirit of enterprise in navigation, and in 1816, when the East India trade was thrown open, one of the first ships to engage in it was a Glasgow venture. The voyage from Glasgow to London was first accomplished by steamer in 1815.

Roads.

Lord Cockburn, who had travelled *circuitously* for forty years, tells us in his "Circuit Journeys" that "those born to the railway, and even the stage, can scarce understand how we of the previous age got along." Macadam, an Ayrshire road-maker (b. 1756), has given his name to progress in travel as notable in its way as that of Stephenson. He revolutionised the old process of keeping up the bridle-tracks, made passable for wheels by statute labour, that was almost as much hated and neglected as the French *corvée*. Going south in 1758 Carlyle of Inveresk found on the most frequented route no trace of a chaise till he reached Durham, where turnpikes were just beginning. For a portion of this route in East Lothian the first Toll Act was obtained (1763). Progress north of Edinburgh had got so far by 1773 that Samuel Johnson found it pleasant to get along through Fife comfortably without tolls. There had long been relays of posts between the capitals, but nowhere else north of Edinburgh till 1776. In 1758 a regular four-horse coach from Glasgow to Edinburgh was started, and contrived to do the distance in the short period of twelve hours. After 1799 the time was reduced by one half. Meanwhile, on the western trunk line, road-making was going on. On the new road up Nithsdale, Burns could see, on his exciseman rounds, toll bars set up (1791), Plummer's coach (1788) doing the distance from Glasgow to

Stages.

London in sixty-five hours, and the Carlisle waggon leaving Dumfries weekly, drawn by six horses. The Forth was as yet crossed at three main points by the old ferries. Smeaton's fine bridge over the Tay at Perth superseded boats in 1771. Forsyth, an Elgin merchant, tells his experience in the Fly coach (1791). Through Forfar the four horses did thirteen miles in three and a half hours. Out of York he had done 150 miles in twenty-four hours, but north of Edinburgh only eighty-four in nineteen hours. Stage-coaches were tried between Perth and Inverness in 1806, but it was not till 1811 that regular mail-coaches were established between Aberdeen and Inverness. Post-runners followed the coast where there were no bridges over the large streams. The Spey had no bridge at Fochabers till 1801. North of the Dornoch Firth the country was almost in a state of nature till the Marquis of Stafford began improving the Sutherland estates (1807). Government gave some aid, but localities made noble efforts, carrying main roads (1814) to Tongue and Wick. At the death of the Marquis he had made 450 miles of road and 134 bridges over ten feet long. His worthy rival, Lord Breadalbane, opened up the Central Highlands. Pennant, the traveller, found (1770) his men busy road-making on Loch Tayside and on by Tyndrum. Throughout the West Highlands, however, travel for any distance had for long to be carried on by sea, a state of matters still largely a necessity from the nature of much of the country.

Bridges.

THE first meeting of the United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland was held in January, 1801, and the Irish Catholics naturally looked for the fulfilment of the promise of Emancipation. But the matter was not so much as referred to in the speech from the throne; which, it is understood, was due to the King's obstinacy. Pitt resigned; a minister hostile to the measure succeeded; and Emancipation apparently receded for ever.

P. W. JOYCE. Ireland.

Meantime the United Irishmen, who now held their meetings on the Continent, having been led to hope for help from Napoleon, commissioned Robert Emmett, an ardent noble-minded young man of

Emmett's Rising.

twenty-four, to carry out their plans for a new rebellion. He spent the winter of 1802 in Dublin making arrangements and manufacturing pikes and other arms. An accident precipitated matters; and in July, 1803, he issued forth with about a hundred men, intending to make a dash on Dublin Castle. But everything went wrong: the mob rose out and began outrages; and Lord Chief Justice Kilwarden, a good man and a most humane judge, who happened to be passing through the streets at the time, was dragged from his carriage and brutally murdered. Emmett, horror-stricken, fled from the city; but he was soon after captured, tried, and hanged in Dublin.

O'Connell.

About this time the greatest of all the Irish popular leaders began his career: Daniel O'Connell, or "The Liberator," as he is familiarly called, who from that time forward was the chief figure in Irish politics for nigh half a century. One of the first public questions in which he took a part was that of the Veto. A small section of Catholics had expressed their willingness to accept Emancipation with the condition attached of allowing the King a veto in the appointment of Catholic bishops; but as soon as the matter became public, the bishops and the general Catholic body led by O'Connell, repudiated any such arrangement; and anyhow Parliament rejected the petition for Emancipation even with the condition (1808).

AUTHORITIES.—1802-1815.

GENERAL HISTORY.

Fyffe, *History of Modern Europe*, vol. i.; Lanfrey, *Life of Napoleon;* Alison, *History of Europe;* Napier, *History of the Peninsular War;* Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the Wars of the French Revolution;* Cornewall Lewis, *Administration of Great Britain:* Martineau, *History of England from* 1800; Erskine May, *Constitutional History;* Stanhope, *Life of Pitt;* Alison, *Life of Lord Castlereagh; Life of Sir C. Stewart;* Yonge, *Life of Lord Liverpool.* Some original authorities: The Cornwallis Correspondence, The Wellesley Despatches, Lady Clementina Davies, *Recollections of Society in France and England;* Croker, *Correspondence*, and *Diaries*, vol. i.; Castlereagh, *Correspondence.*

SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

Military History.—Dupin, *History and Actual State of the Military Force of Great Britain;* Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown;* Bunbury, *Passages in the Great War with France;* Marshall, *Military Miscellany;* Holden, *Short History of the Green Packet*, in *United Service Magazine*, vol. iv. new series: *Diary of Lt. Swabey, R.H.A.*, in *Proceedings of Royal Artillery Institution*, xxii., 10; Holden, *History of the IIIrd and IVth Battalions of the Worcester Regiment;*

Curling, *Recollections of Rifleman Harris;* Grey, *Walcheren Expedition;* Whitelocke, *Authentic Narrative of the Proceedings under Brigadier Craufurd* (against Monte Video); Craufurd, *Craufurd and his Light Division;* Sir W. F. Butler, *Plea for the Peasant;* Holden, *Vicissitudes of Regimental Colours* (*Journ. U. Service Inst.*, xxix., 204).

Science and Philosophy.—Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences:* Biographical articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica.* For the position of Thomas Brown in the history of Associationism, see Croom Robertson on "Association of Ideas" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and his *Philosophical Remains.*

Literature (1784-1815).—For the best account of the so-called Classical School of English Poetry, about to be displaced by the "Romantic-Naturalist" movement, see Professor Courthope's criticisms *passim* in Pope's Works, ed. *Elwin and Courthope*, with the poet's life by the latter author. For a general view of the literary history of the period, see Gosse's *Eighteenth Century Literature.* For precursors of the movement, the same author's "Gray," and Goldwin Smith's "Cowper" in *English Men of Letters* series; also the paper on "Crabbe" in Saintsbury's *Essays in English Literature*, 1760-1860. But for a complete and correct comprehension of the "Romantic-Naturalist" revival, the nature of its aims and the sum of its achievements, the student, after a careful perusal of Wordsworth's preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* (2nd edition), should thoroughly master Coleridge's incomparable criticism of its theories in his *Biographia Literaria*, chapters xiv.-xx. For the prose of this period, see the critical studies prefixed to specimens of Burke, Gibbon, Robertson, Mackintosh, in Craik's *English Prose Selections*, vol. iv.; also the monographs on the two first-mentioned writers in the *English Men of Letters* series. But this part of his subject is one on which "books about books" can help the student but little; he will learn far more from a diligent study of the great models themselves.

Manufactures (1784-1815).—Textiles: E. Baines, *History of the Cotton Manufacture;* A. J. Warden, *The Linen Trade;* W. Felkin, *Hosiery and Lace;* J. Burnley, *History of Wool and Woolcombing;* A. Barlow, *History and Principles of Weaving;* J. Bischoff, *A Comprehensive History of the Woollen and Worsted Manufactures;* W. Radcliffe, *Origin of the Power Loom.* Iron and coal: H. Scrivener, *History of the Iron Trade;* J. Percy, *Metallurgy: A treatise upon Coal Mines*, 1769; a few articles in the *Annual Register* and *The Philosophical Transactions*, and some information in the *Statistical Account of Scotland.* For the lives of the numerous inventors consult *Dictionary of National Biography;* F. Espinasse, *Lancashire Worthies;* S. Smiles, *Industrial Biography, Lives of the Engineers, Lives of Boulton and Watt;* Muirhead, *Life of Watt;* Bennet Woodcroft, *Brief Biographies of Inventors.* Ceramic Art: L. L. Jewitt, *History of Ceramic Art, Lives of the Wedgwoods;* Meteyard, *Life of Josiah Wedgwood;* Chaffers, *History of Pottery and Porcelain.* County histories give scattered information on various industrial subjects. A general sketch of the Industrial Revolution is given in A. Toynbee's *Industrial Revolution.* Dr. W. Cunningham's account of the same period in *English Industry and Commerce* is valuable, and the list of authorities at the end of the book elucidates the social effect of the inventions. See generally Arthur Young's *Tours;* and C. Knight's *Popular History*, for a general summary.

Naval History, The Church, Art, Economic History, and *Scottish History* as in c. xix. *Social Life* as in c. xviii. *Ireland* as in c. xix.

INDEX.

Abercrombie, General, and the invasion of Canada, 197
Abercrombie, Sir Ralph, and the expedition to Egypt, 388-390
Aberration of light, 246
Addington's Ministry, 371, 515
Addison and his school, 73
Admiralty, the, and naval promotion, 21, 393, 394; and the naval *personnel*, 208
Africa, exploration in, 402, 403
Agriculture (1689-1742), 99-109; (1742-1784), 301-305; (1784-1802), 452-459; in Scotland, 160, 161, 502, 503
Aix-la-Chapelle, Peace of, 183, 192
Alexander, William, and water-colour painting, 573
Alexandria, battle of, 389
Alien Act, 370
All-the-Talents, Ministry of, 517, 518
America: discovery and exploration, 34, 221, 227; and the Stamp Act, 177; and the conquest of Canada, 185, 186, 193-200; War of Independence, 187, 201-203, 326; taxation, 327-331; effect of the war on Ireland, 362; War of 1813, 521
Amiens, Peace of, 371, 390, 391, 515, 551
Amusements, 142-144, 165, 498
Anglo-Saxon, study of, 72
Anson's voyages, 219-221
Antarctic exploration, 225
Apothecaries, 48
Apothecaries' Society, 420, 554, 555
Apprentices, 602, 603, 616, 617
Arbitration in commercial litigation, 35
Arbuthnot, works of, 79, 80
Arctic exploration, 22, 402
Arkwright, Richard, spinning-frame of, 309, 310
Armed neutrality, 478
Army, the (1714-1742), 11-18; (1742-1784), 189-207; (1784-1802), 378-391; (1802-1815, 523-541
Army medical service, 557
Art (1714-1742), 88-91; (1742-1784), 270-301; (1784-1802), 430-437; (1802-1815), 557-578
Associational psychology, 243, 244
Astrology, 47
Astronomy, 246, 546, 547
Atterbury, Bishop, 404
Austerlitz, Battle of, 517
Australia, Dampier's voyages to, 27-29; Captain Cook's visit to, 224; expeditions of 1784-1802, 391, 392, 402
Authorities (1715-1742), 169-171; (1742-1784), 364, 365; (1784-1802), 512-514; (1802-1815), 626

Bacon, John, and his sculpture, 576, 577
Baillie, Matthew, 554
Bakewell and his stock-breeding, 303-305
Bangorian Controversy, 406
Bank of England: suspension of cash payments, 371; issue of Exchequer bills, 477, 609
Banks, Thomas, and his sculpture, 577
Barber-Surgeons, 48, 49, 420
Barrow, Isaac, as Greek lecturer at Cambridge, 57
Barry, James, 431
BATESON, M., Social Life (1714-1742), 137-155; (1742-1784), 345-358; (1784-1802), 488-500; the state of Society (1802-1815), 613-622
Baxter, William, works of, 58, 59
BEAZLEY, C. RAYMOND: Exploration (1642-1742), 24-34; (1742-1784), 219-229; (1784-1802), 401-403; the Established Church (1715-1815), 403-413
Beechey, William, 433, 434
Bell, Sir Charles, and animal physiology, 552, 553
Benefit of clergy, 35
Bentham, his ethics and political influence, 414, 415; and prison reform, 487
Bentinck, Lord William, 537
Bentley, Richard, works of, 59, 60, 65-68; attack on Epistles of Phalaris, 61-63; as Master of Trinity, 64; influence on his scholars, 69
Bequests of personal property, 35
Berkeley and his doctrines, 42, 43
Berlin Decrees, 518, 616
Bewick, Thomas, 568
Bible: Polyglot edition, 71
Biblical criticism, 67, 71
Black, Joseph, and his chemical investigations, 246, 247
Blackburne, Francis, and subscription to formularies, 407
Blake, William, 444, 445, 567, 568
Blane, Sir Gilbert, 427
Bleaching, 471
Bligh, Lieutenant William, 401
Blue stockings, 357
Board of Longitude, 209
Bolingbroke, opposition to Walpole, 6; his writings, 84
Bonaparte, 516-523, 530-532, 614-616
Bone, Henry, 565
Book illustration, 566
Botany Bay penal colony, 391
Boulter, Archbishop, and his management of English interests in Ireland, 169
Boulton, Matthew, 461, 462
Bounties to seamen, 394, 395
Bounty, mutiny of the, 401
Boyle, and his work in chemistry, 46, 47
Boyle, Hon. Charles, and the Epistles of Phalaris, 61
Boyle Lectures, 60

Bradley, James, and the aberration of light, 246
Bridges, 598, 621
Brindley, James, and the canal system, 322-326
British and Foreign School Society, 499
Broad-Bottom Administration, 173
Brougham, Lord, 590
BROWN, J.: Nonconformity (1689-1815), 229-240
Brown, Robert, and botanical classification, 552
Brown, Thomas, and the theory of causation, 553, 554
Bruce, James, travels of, 402
Buccaneers, 23, 24-33
Buenos Ayres, expedition to, 540
Bunker's Hill, 201
Burdett, Sir Francis, 619, 620
Burgoyne, General, 203, 204
Burke, 451, 452, 488, 489
Burney, Frances, 357
Burns, Robert, 445, 446
Bute's Ministry, 174, 176, 185
Butler, Bishop, and his works, 43, 44, 408
Byng, Vice-Admiral John, court-martial on, 207, 399
Byron, John, and his voyages, 221, 222
Byron, Lord, early poems of, 585, 586

Cabinet of George I., 2
Cabinet system, 5; efforts of George III. to abolish it, 175
Calendar, reform of the, 173, 353, 354
Callcott, Sir Augustus, 561
Campbell, Thomas, 586, 587
Cameronian Church, the, 158 159
Canada, conquest of, 185, 186, 193-200; division into provinces, 369
Canals, 322-326, 621, 623
Canton, John, electrical discoveries of, 249
Capital punishment, 351
Capital trials, legislation for, 36, 37
Card-playing, 143, 144
Carlini, Agostino, 576
Carteret, Captain, and his voyages, 222, 223
Carteret, Lord, and the Wilmington Ministry, 172, 173; foreign policy, 181
Carthagena expedition, 14, 15
Cartwright, and the power loom, 469
Casaubon, works of, 54, 55
Casaubon, Meric, 58
Castlereagh, Lord, 511, 512
Catholic disabilities, and Sir George Saville's measure, 179; 369
Catholic Relief Bill, 360 (*see* Roman Catholics)
Cattle-breeding, 301, 304, 305
Cavendish, Henry, 415, 416
Ceramics, 117
Chalon, Alfred, 565
Chapman, George, translation of Homer by, 56
Charities, 48, 49, 146
Charles Edward, Pretender, and the battles of Prestonpans and Culloden, 183, 191, 192
Chatterton, works of, 264, 265
Chemistry, 46, 47, 247, 547, 548
Chesterfield, Lord, and the calendar, 173; works of, 269, 270
Children, treatment of, 152, 153
Chili, Craufurd's expedition to, 539-541
Church, The, 403-413, 544-546
Church and State, 403-406
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, 406
Clayton, Bishop, 407
Clergy: fund for augmentation of livings, 36; social life, 409, 410
Clipperton, John, expedition of, 33
Clive, Robert, afterwards Lord Clive, 189, 378-381
CLOWES, W. LAIRD: The Navy (1714-1742), 19-23; (1742-1784), 207-218; (1784-1802), 391-401; (1802-1815), 541-544
Coaches, 150, 347, 624, 625
Coal, its use in smelting, 115, 464, 468; mining, 314; its transit, 322
Coalition Ministry, 180
Cobbett, and reform agitation, 619
Coffee-houses, 147, 148
Coleridge, 446, 579-584
College of Maynooth, 509
College of Physicians, 48, 420, 554, 555
Collins, poetry of, 262, 263
Colonial expansion, 522, 534
Colonial taxation, 327-331
COLVILLE, J.: Scotland (1714-1742), 155-167; (1742-1784), 358-360; (1784-1802), 500-505
Combination Acts, 491
Congress of Vienna, 522
Conscription for the Militia, 525
Constable, John, 563
Convention of Cintra, 520
Convocation, closing of, 405
Cook, Captain James, and his voyages, 223-229
Cooper, Samuel, 564
Copley, John Singleton, 431, 432
Copyright, law of, 37-39
Cornwallis, Lord, 511
Corporation Act, 203-233
Corresponding Societies Bill, 371, 491
Cort, Henry, and the iron trade, 464, 465, 466
Corunna, Battle of, 520, 539
Cosway, Richard, 565
Cotman, John Sell, 563
Cotton trade, 472-474, 595, 601
Country life, 100, 101, 132, 133, 149
Court of the Marches of Wales, abolition of, 35
Courts-martial, 207, 399, 528
Cowper, William, 442-444
Cox, David, 575, 576
Cozens, John, 573, 574
Crabbe, George, 446, 447
Craftsman, The, 6
Credulity of the people, 48
Creech, Thomas, 58
Crime, 145, 146, 350, 351
Crisis of 1793, 476, 477; of 1811-14, 608, 609
Criticism, literature of, 589-591
Crome, John, 561-563
Crompton's "mule," 310, 311
CROWEST, F. J.: Handel and English Music, 91-99
Cruikshank, George, 572
Cruikshank, Isaac, 571, 572
Culloden, Battle of, 183, 192
Culture, 166, 167
Currency, 479, 608
Cylinder printing, 471, 472

Dahl, paintings of, 88
Dalrymple, Sir Hew, and the Convention of Cintra, 520
Dalton, and the Atomic theory, 547, 548
Dampier, William, voyages of, 26-31
Dancing, 141, 142, 165
Danish Fleet, seizure of, 519
Darien Scheme, 34
Darwin, Erasmus, 419
Dashwood, Sir George, and the reform of Parliament, 173
Davy, Sir Humphry, 549

Debt, imprisonment for, 484
Decomposition of water, 416
Defoe, Daniel, writings of, 85-87, 126
Deism, 41, 408, 409
Delany, Mrs., and her Autobiography, 150-152
De Quincey, 588
Derby and Chelsea China, 321, 322
Despard, Colonel, plot of, 613
Dettingen, Battle of, 182, 189
Devonshire-Pitt Administration, 174
Dilettanti Society, 271, 345
Disabilities of Nonconformists, 230-235
Dissent in Scotland, 158, 159; in England, 229-240, 405, 407
Distillation of salt water, 211
Documents, legal, language of, 40
Dodwell, Henry, works of, 59
Downes, Andrew, Greek scholarship of, 55
Drama, 141, 142, 263, 264; in Scotland, 165
Dress of men, 140, 355, 494-496; of women, 140, 141, 356, 497
Drunkenness, 50, 136
Dundas, Henry (*see* Melville, Viscount)
Dupleix, 378
Duport, James, works of, 57

East India Company, 366, 378-382, 384, 385
Edinburgh Review, 590
Edridge, Henry, 565
Education, 153, 166, 499
Egypt: British expedition of 1801, 388-390
Electricity, 46, 248-250, 415, 416, 548, 549
Eliot, John, missionary to the Indians, 34
Emmett, Robert, rising of, in Ireland, 516, 625
Enclosures, 337, 458
Engineering, 598-600, 620
Engraving, 566, 572
Epidemics, 50, 51, 556
Episcopacy in Scotland, 158
Erskine, Thomas and Henry, 502
Essayists, the, 269
Established Church, the, 403-413, 544-546
Evangelical revival, 410, 411
Exchequer Bills, 477, 609
Excise Bill of 1733, 6, 123-126
Exploration, 22; (1642-1742), 24-34; (1742-1784), 219-229; (1784-1802), 391, 392, 401-403
Exports and imports (1795-1815), 606, 609

Factory Act, 603
Fairs, 133
Family life, 150, 151
Farming (*see* Agriculture, Land, etc.)
Felony, trials for, reform of, 36, 37
Fielding, novels of, 257, 258; his voyage to Lisbon, 345
Finance (1714-1742), 117-130; (1742-1784), 326-336; (1784-1802), 474-482
Fire-engines, 316, 317
Fiscal system (1714-1742), 119-126
Fitzgerald, Lord Edward, 509, 510
Flaxman, John, 577, 578
Flinders, Matthew, and Australian exploration, 402
Flogging in the Army, 528, 529
Flood, Henry, 362
Fontenoy, Battle of, 190
Food and drink, 148, 348-350, 493, 494, 622
Foreign contingents in the British Army, 524
Foreign policy of England (1714-1742), 7-11; (1742-1784), 180-188; (1784-1802), 372-378
Fox, Henry (afterwards first Lord Holland), and the Broad-Bottom Administration, 173, 174
Fox, Charles James, and the Coalition Ministry, 180; attitude towards slave trade and towards Regency question, 368; Libel Act, 369; attempts to abolish Tests, *ibid.*, in Ministry of All-the-Talents (1806), 517
France: the Triple Alliance, 8; and the policy of Walpole, 10; declares war against England (1744), 182; Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 183; Treaty of Versailles, 184; struggle with England in India and America, 184, 185, 192; Peace of Paris, 186; Peace of Versailles (1783), 188; commercial treaty with England, 367, 475; the Revolution, 369, 370; war with England, 370, 371; relations with England (1795-1802), 377; operations in India, 378, 379, 381-384; Egyptian campaign, 388-390; Irish Rebellion, 509, 511; war with England, 516-518, 520-522; emigrants in England, 614
Franklin, Benjamin, and electrical discovery, 248
Free trade, in Ireland, 362
French Revolution, effects of, 369, 370, 488 490, 498, 516
"Friends of the People," 490, 501, 502
Funeral ceremonies, 155

Gage, General, and the American War of Independence, 201, 202
Gainsborough, pictures of, 290-295
Gale, Thomas, works of, 58
Gambling: Act of Queen Anne, 36; 143, 144, 355, 498
Garth, and the Phalaris controversy, 63
Gas, used for street-lighting, 463, 464, 613, 621
Gataker, Thomas, translations of, 56
Gay, writings of, 80
Gentleman's Magazine, 352
Geology, 417
George I.: his first Cabinet, 2; foreign policy, 8-10; his Court, 137, 138
George II.: Court manners, 138, 139; and Pelham's Ministry, 173; at Dettingen, 189
George III.: his struggle with the Whigs and attack on Cabinet government, 175, 176; his Court, 354, 355; Regency Bill, 368, 369; attacked by the mob, 491; and the Ministry of All-the-Talents, 519; reviewing the Volunteer Corps, 615
Gibbon, and the "Decline and Fall," 268, 448-450
Gibraltar, siege of (1727), 12; (1779-1783), 206
Gifford, William, 441, 442
Gilbert's Act, 340, 341
Gillray, James, 569, 570
Girtin, Thomas, 575
Glass trade, 116
Goldsmith, works of, 264
Gordon Riots, 179
Grafton Ministry, 177
Graham, R.A., John, 558
Grattan's Parliament, 363
Grenville, George, and the attack on Wilkes, 176
GRETTON, G. LE M.: The Army (1714-1742), 11-18; (1742-1784), 189-207; (1784-1802), 378-391; (1802-1815), 523-541
Gray, poems of, 263

Gray, Stephen, and his electrical discoveries, 46
GRIFFITHS, ARTHUR: Prison Reform 482-488
Grub Street, and its denizens, 251-253
Gruter, Janus, works of, 54

Habeas Corpus Act, suspension of, 370
Hales, Dr. Stephen, and his "Statical Essays," 47
Handel, career and works of, 91-99
Hardware trades, 114
Hargreaves, James, spinning jenny of, 308, 309
Hartley, David, and associational psychology, 243, 244
HASSALL, A.: Political History (1714-1742), 2-11; Home Politics and England's Foreign Policy (1742-1784), 172-188; Political History (1784-1802), 366-378; (1802-1815), 512-522
Hawke, Lord, 210, 400
Hayley, William, 440, 441
Hazlitt, 588
Hebrew, study of, 70
Herschel, Sir William, 546, 547
Hibernian Marine Society, 213
Hickes, Dr. George, and the study of Anglo-Saxon, 72
High Church party, 411
Hoadly, Bishop, 405
Hoare, William, pastellist, 572
Hogarth, life and works of, 272-277, 569
Holland, Philemon, translations of, 56
Holland: campaign of 1793, 386, 387; campaign of 1799, 388
Hone, Nathaniel, 565
Hoppner, John, 433
Horne, George, Bishop of Norwich, 409
Hospitals, 48, 49, 425, 428
Hours of Meals, 349
House of Commons: the beginning of the struggle for its reform, 172; publication of debates, 352, 353
Howard, John, 482-486
Hudson, John, works of, 58
Hudson, Thomas, paintings of, 271
HUGHES, R.: Art (1742-1784), 270-301; (1784-1802), 430-437; (1802-1815), 557-578
Hume, his "Treatise of Human Nature," 44, 45, 240, 241; his work in philosophy, etc., 241-243; his "History of England," 267
Hunter, John, 419, 422, 423
Hunter, William, 423, 424, 554
Hutcheson, Francis, and his philosophical works, 41, 42
Hutton, James, 417, 418
HUTTON, W. H.: The Church (1802-1815), 544-546
Hydraulic press, 599
Hygiene, 426-429

Illustration of books, 566
Impressment, 208
Income tax, 371, 480, 493
Independents, 239, 240
India: government, 366, 367; growth of British power, 378-385
Industrial revolution, 600, 601
Inns, 150, 348
Inoculation for small-pox, 51, 52
Invasion panic (1803), 614, 615
Ireland: linen trade, 113; effect of repressive legislation, 167, 168; conflict of the Lords with the English House of Lords, 168; assertion of independence by Molyneux and Swift, 168, 169; Wood's patent, 116, 169; the two Parliamentary parties, 360, 506; secret societies, 361, 507; emigration of Presbyterians, 361; the Volunteers, 362; free trade, 362, 363; Grattan's Parliament, 363, 364; Union with Great Britain, 371; Irishmen in the British Army, 524; United Irishmen, 507-509; Catholic Emancipation, 508, 626; Rebellion of 1798, 509-511; the Union, 511, 512; Emmett's rising, 512, 626: O'Connell, 627
Iron trade, 114-116, 311-314, 464-468, 601
Italian opera, 91-94
Italy, campaign in, 536, 537

Jackson, Cyril, Dean of Christ Church, 546
Jacobite clergy, 404
Jacobites: rebellion of 1715, 3, 11, 156, 157; outrages on meeting-houses, 230; movement in Scotland (1792), 501; amongst the clergy, 404; Colonel Despard's plot, 613
Jeffrey, Francis, 590, 591
Jenner, Edward, and vaccination, 428, 429
Jervas, paintings of, 89, 90
Jews, Act for naturalisation of, 174
Johnson, Samuel, career and works of, 253-257, 544
Joint tillage, 453, 454
Jones of Nayland, 409
JOYCE, P. W.: Ireland (1714-1742), 167-169; (1742-1784), 360-364; (1784-1802), 505-512

Kames, Lord, and agriculture in Scotland, 502, 503
Kauffmann, Angelica, 566
Kay, John, the flying shuttle of, 307
Kidd, Captain, expedition of, 32, 33
Kidnapping, 395
Knapton, Francis, 572
Kneller, paintings of, 88
Knitting trade, 113, 114

Lace trade, 113, 114, 597
Ladbrooke, Robert, 563
Lake School, 583
Lamb, Charles, 588
Land: registration of title to, 39, 40; cultivation of, 100-109, 454-459; taxation, 120, 121, 331, 611; tenure, 454
Language of legal documents, 40
Languages, Oriental, study of, 70-72
Latitudinarians, 406-408
Laud, Archbishop, and the study of Oriental languages, 70
Law, history of (1688-1742), 34-40
Lawlessness, 145, 146, 350, 351, 489
Lawrence, Sir Thomas, 435-437
Letters of Junius, 352
Lexington, Battle of, 201
Leyland, John, 409
Libel Act, 370
Lifeboats, 542
Life-saving apparatus, 542, 543
Lightfoot, John, works of, 71
Lightships, 22
Linen trade, 473, 474
Lister, Dr., 417
Literature (1714-1742), 72-88; (1742-1784), 250-270; (1784-1802), 438-452; (1802-1815), 578-591
Liverpool Ministry, 521
Lombe, Sir Thomas, and John, and the silk trade, 111, 112

London: growth, 147; life, 147
Longitude, Board of, 209
Lotteries, 144
Louisbourg, capture of, 198
Luddites, 598, 618

Macadam, and road-making, 621, 624
"Macaronis" and "jessamies," 355
Machinery, improvements in, 592-598
Mackintosh, Sir James, 452
Maclaurin, Colin, and his works, 45, 46
Macpherson, "Ossian," 261, 265
Maida, victory of, 536
Mail coaches, 347
Malthus, 481, 482
Mandeville, Bernard de, and his "Fable of the Bees," 41
Manners, in the Courts of George I. and George II., 137-139; in the Court of George III., 354, 355; (1802-1815), 621, 622
Manufacture (1714-1742), 110-117; (1742-1784), 305-326; (1784-1802), 459-474; (1802-1815), 591-604; in Scotland (1714-1742), 163, 164
Marine Society, 208, 212
Marine surveying, 22
Maritime supremacy, 181, 183
Marlborough, Duke of, 378
Marriage Act, Lord Hardwicke's, 174, 354
Marriage-law and ceremonies, 154, 155
Masquerades, 141, 142
Mathematics, 45
Mathews, Vice-Admiral Thomas, court-martial on, 207, 399
Maynooth College, 509
Mead, Dr., and astrology, 47
Medical schools, 424, 425
Medicine (1714-1742), 47-52; (1742-1802), 419-429; (1802-1815), 554-557
Melville, Viscount, 500, 517, 542
Mercantile legislation, 35, 36
Mercantile Theory, The, 332-336
Metal trades, 114-116
Mezzotint engravers, 573
Military reform, 385
Military tactics, 18, 385
Militia Bill, 360, 525
Milton, scholarship of, 56, 57
Minden, Battle of, 185
Miniature painting, 564, 565
Montagu, Mrs., 357
MONTAGUE, F. C.: History of Law (1688-1742), 34-40
Moore, Sir John, 520, 539
Moore, Thomas, 587
More, Hannah, 544
Morgan, Sir Henry, buccaneering adventures of, 25, 26
Morland, George, 559-561
Mortmain Act of George II., 40
Moser, Michael, 565
Music, 91-99; in Scotland, 165
Musketry, 532
Muslin trade, 472
Mutiny of the *Bounty*, 396, 397, 401

Naples, expedition to, 535, 536
Nasmyth, Patrick, 560, 561
National Debt, 126, 326, 368, 481
National economy, 336-345
Natural realism, 413
Naturalisation of the Jews, Act for, 174
Nautical Almanac, 209
Naval Asylum, 542
Naval improvements, 210, 211
Naval *personnel*, 208
Naval voyages, 22
Navigation, scientific, 209
Navy, the (1714-1742), 19-23; (1742-1784), 207-218; (1784-1802), 391-401; (1802-1815), 541-544
New Caledonia, discovery of, 226
Newcastle Ministry, 174
Newcastle-Pitt Ministry, 174, 185
New Guinea, Dampier's voyage to, 30
Newspapers, 167, 351, 352
New Zealand: Captain Cook's visits, 224, 225; Vancouver's survey, 392
Nollekens, Joseph, 577
Nonconformity (1689-1815), 229-240
Nonjurors, 412
Nootka Sound, the affair of, 376
North, Lord, and the measures carried by his Government, 178, 179; and the Coalition Ministry, 180
North, Sir Thomas, translations of, 55, 56
Northcote, James, 432, 433
North-West Passage, 227

O'Connell, Daniel, 627
O. P. Riots, 620
Occasional Conformity Act, 5, 236
Ogle, Sir Chaloner, and the suppression of piracy, 23
Oglethorpe, General James, 34
Open-field system, 102-105, 454, 457
Opera, Italian, 91-94
Opie, John, 433
Oratorios, 95-99
Overland travel, 33, 34
Oxygen, discovery of, 247, 248

Packe, Dr. Christopher, 417
Paine, Tom, 409, 489, 490
Painting (1714-1742), 88-90; (1742-1784), 270-301; (1784-1802), 430-437; (1802-1815), 557-576
Palæontology, 419
Paley's ethics, 413, 414
Panic of 1793, 476, 477
Paris, Peace of, 181, 186
Park, Mungo, 402
Parliamentary debates, publication of, 352, 353
Parliamentary reform, 179, 367, 370, 619
Parr, Dr., 545
Pastellists, 572
Pathology, 423
Pauperism, 336-341, 607, 608
Payne, William, and water-colour painting, 574
Peace of Amiens, 371, 390, 391, 515
Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 183, 192
Peace of Paris, 181, 186
Peace of Vienna, 521
Pearson, Bishop, scholarship of, 58
Peel's Act, 603
Pelham's Ministry, 173
Peninsular War, 520-523
Penitentiary Houses, 485
Perceval Ministry, 520, 521
Perkins, Captain John, 396
Phalaris, Epistles of, controversy on, 60-63
Philanthropy, 499
Philosophy (1714-1742), 41-45; (1742-1784), 240-250; (1784-1802), 413-415; (1802-1815), 553, 554
Piracy, 23
Pitcairn's Island, settlement at, 402
Pitt, William (afterwards Lord Chatham) and the reaction in politics, 172; admitted to office, 173; First Secretary of State under the Duke of Devonshire, 174; and the Seven

Years' War, 174, 184; withdraws from the Grafton Ministry, 178
Pitt, the younger, William: first appointment to office, 180; as Prime Minister, 180, 366-368; his Bill for Parliamentary Reform and financial measures, 367, 368, 474, 475, 480; summary of his administration (1784-1792), 369; repressive measures, 370; his fall, 371; foreign policy, 373-377, 488, 489; Catholic emancipation and the Union, 508, 511; second Ministry, 516, 517; death, 517; and the Volunteer Corps, 615
Plassey, battle of, 380, 381
Poetry (1714-1742), 73-83; (1742-1784), 260-264; (1784-1802), 438-447; (1802-1815), 578-587
Polar exploration, 22, 402
Police, 351
Political history (1714-1742), 2-11; (1742-1784), 172-188; (1784-1802), 366-378; (1802-1815), 515-522
Political Societies, 490
Poor Law, 133-135, 339-341, 607
Pope, Alexander, his attack on Richard Bentley, 68; his writings, 73-78; influence, 438, 439
Population of England and Wales, 131, 478, 608, 611
Portland Administration, 519, 520
Postal reform, 347
Potter, Archbishop, classical works of, 58
Pottery trade, 117, 317-322
POWER, D'ARCY: Medicine (1714-1742), 47-52; (1742-1802), 419-429; (1802-1815), 554-557
Power loom, 469, 470, 592
Presbyterians, Irish, emigration of, 361, 362
Pressgang, 360
Prestonpans, battle of, 183, 191
Price, Richard, ethics of, 245
Prices, rise in, 337, 338, 491-494, 609, 612
Priestley, Joseph, and his philosophic writings, 244; and the discovery of oxygen, 247
Pringle, Sir John, 426
Prison reform, 482-488
Prisons, 427, 483-488
Prize-money, 213, 221
Promissory notes, law of, 36
Promotion, naval, 20, 21, 393, 394
Property, right of bequeathing, 35
PROTHERO, R. E.: Agriculture (1689-1742), 99-109; (1742-1784), 301-305; (1784-1802), 452-459
Provincial life, 148, 149
Public Health (1714-1742), 50-52; (1742-1802), 427, 428; (1802-1815), 556

Quadruple Alliance, the, 9
Quarterly Review, 590
Quebec, fall of, 200
Quiberon, battle at, 400

Radcliffe, William, and improvements in the power loom, 592-594
Radicalism, English, birth of, 178
Raeburn, Henry, 434, 435
Ramsay, Allan, and the "Easy Club," etc., 164
Ranelagh Gardens, 142, 498
Rawdon, Lord, and promotion in the navy, 393
Rebellion of Jacobites, 3, 11, 156, 157
Recruiting, 16, 523, 524
Reform of the Calendar, 173, 353, 354
Reform in military finance, 385, 386
Reform, opposition to, 353
Reform, Parliamentary, first efforts for, 179, 367, 370, 619
Reformed Church of Scotland, 158
Registration of title to land, 39, 40
Reid, Thomas, 413
Religion in Scotland, 158-160
Revenue, 119-126, 478, 601
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, and his works, 280-287
Ricardo, economic theories of, 609, 610
Richardson, novels of, 257, 258
Richardson, Jonathan, paintings of, 89, 90
Riots (1790, etc.), 489-492; against machinery, 596-598, 618; of 1809, 620
Rise in prices, 337, 338, 491-494, 609, 612
River navigation, 322
Roads, 149, 346, 347, 455, 456, 620; in Scotland, 162
Robertson, William, works of, 267
Robinson, Sir Thomas, 174
Rockingham Ministry, 177; second Ministry, 179
Rodney, Admiral, 400
Roman Catholics: their enfranchisement in Ireland and proposed emancipation, 508; repeal of restrictive measures in Ireland, 363; Relief Bill (1778), 360; Veto question, 627
Romney, George, life and works of, 295-301
Roubillac, Louis, 90, 576
Rowlandson, Thomas, 570, 571
Royal Academy, 287-289
Royal College of Surgeons, 421, 554, 555
Royal Marriage Act, 179
Royal Naval Asylum, 542
Rumford, Count, 549
Rural life, 100, 101, 132, 133
Russia: relations with England, 10, 187; seizure of the Crimea, 372; war with Turkey, 373; relations with England (1790), 375; the expedition to Naples and Sicily, 535

SAINTSBURY G.: Literature (1714-1742), 72-88; (1742-1784), 250-270
Sandby, Paul, and water-colour painting, 573
SANDYS, J. E., English scholarship (1570-1742), 53-72
Sanitation, 426-428
Saratoga, surrender of, 204
Savile, Sir Henry, works of, 55
Saville, Sir George, and Catholic disabilities, 179
Scaliger, works of, 54
Schism Act, repeal of, 4, 5
Schism of Whigs (1717), 4
Scholarship (1570-1742), 53-72
Science, 45-47, 245-250, 546-553
Scientific navigation, 209
Scotland: agriculture, 105, 106, 502, 503; manufacture and trade, 113, 163, 164, 504, 505, 622; political history, 155-158, 500-502; religion and rise of Dissent, 158-160; condition of the country, 160, 161; the Highland question, 161, 162; social life, 164-166; culture, 166, 167; the rising of '45, 358, 359; navigation, 623; roads, 162, 624; coaches, 624, 625; bridges, 625
Scott, Sir Walter, 585, 588
Sculpture (1714-1742), 90, 91; (1802-1815), 576 578
Secret societies, 361, 507
Sedition, 489 492
Selden, works of, 56, 70

Septennial Act, 4
Servants, 153
Settlement of Europe after the battle of Waterloo, 522
Seven Years' War and the influence of William Pitt, 174, 184, 185; cost, 326
Sheep-rearing, 303, 304
Shelburne, Lord, 177, 179, 180
Shelley, early poems of, 586
Shelvocke, George, expedition of, 33
Shenstone, works of, 262
Sheridan, dramas of, 266
Sheriffmuir, battle of, 3, 11, 156
Silk trade, 111, 112
Sinking fund, 129, 130, 326, 368, 475
Skilled mechanics, 599
Slave trade, 368, 518
Smallpox, epidemics of, 51, 555, 556
SMITH, A. L.: Finance (1714-1742), 117-130; social economy (1714-1742), 131-136; finance (1742-1784), 326-336; national economy (1742-1784), 336-345
Smith, Adam, as a moral philosopher, 243; and economic policy, 331, 332; and the effect of the "Wealth of Nations," 332, 481
Smith John, and water-colour painting, 574
Smith, Sydney, 590
Smith, William, and the study of geology, 418, 419
Smollett, works of, 257, 259
Smuggling, 328, 332, 350, 360, 367
Social economy (1714-1742), 131-136; (1802-1815), 604-613
Social life (1714-1742), 137-155; (1742-1784), 345-358; (1784 1802), 488-500; (1802-1815) 613-622; in Scotland (1714-1742), 164-166
Social life of the clergy, 409, 410
Social life of the Navy, 214-218
Societies, political, 490
Society of Arts, 271, 287
Society for the Reformation of Manners, 499
South Sea Bubble, 127-129, 144, 145
South Seas, voyages to, 22, 26, 223, 226, 227, 401
Southey, Robert, 583, 584, 588, 589
Spain, war with, 11, 13-15; and the siege of Gibraltar, 12; trade with, 13; relations with England (1742-1784), 181-186; and Anson's achievements, 219, 220
Spinning and weaving, 113, 305-311, 592-597
"Spitalfields Acts," 344
Stamp Act, 177, 328, 329
Stanhope's Ministry, 4, 5, 9
Stanley, Thomas, his edition of "Æschylus," 58
Stark, James, 563
Steam-engines, 315-317, 459-464, 594
Steam-hammer, 462, 463
Steam navigation, 600, 623
Sterne, works of, 259
Stewart, Dugald, 501, 553
Stothard, Thomas, 566, 567
Strikes, 344, 617, 618, 619
Stuart, General, and the victory of Maida, 536
Subscription to formularies, 407, 408
Sunday observance, 499
Sunday Schools, 499
Surgery, 47, 48, 420-424
Swift, and the Phalaris controversy, 63; his writings, 71, 79; his "Drapier's Letters," 169
SYMES, J. E.: Finance (1784-1802), 474-482; The Social Economy (1802-1815), 604-613
Tactics: military, 18, 385, 529-532; naval, 399, 400
Tahiti, Captain Cook's visits to, 223, 224, 226, 401
Taxation, 110, 119-126, 136, 349, 350, 476, 479-481, 494, 606; in Scotland, 157, 158; Colonial, 327-331
Taylor, Brook, and his "Methodus Incrementorum Directa et Inversa," 45
Telford, Thomas, and engineering, 620, 621
Temple, Sir William, and his "Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning," 60, 61
Test Act, 231-233
Textile industries, 468-470
Theatres, 142, 143; in Scotland, 165
Theological controversies, 406-409
Thompson, Commodore Edward, and his autobiography, 216-218
Thomson, James, writings of, 82, 83
Thornhill, paintings of, 88, 89
Tilsit, Treaty of, 519
Tobacco, taxation of, 123
Toleration Act, 229-233
Tone, Theobald Wolfe, 507, 508, 509
Tories: opposition to Walpole's government, 6; support of George III., 175
Townshend, Charles, and taxation of American imports, 178
Townshend, Viscount, and agricultural improvement, 108, 109
Townshend's Ministry, 2, 3
Trade (*see* Manufacture, Finance, Social Economy, etc.)
Trade Unions, 341-344, 491, 492, 616, 617
Trafalgar, battle of, 517
TRAILL, H. D.: Literature (1784-1802), 438-452; (1802-1815), 578-591
Transit of Venus at Tahiti, observation of, 223
Translations from the Classics, 55-59
Transportation, 486
Travelling, 150, 154, 345-347, 614; in Scotland, 162
Treason, trial for, reform of, 36, 37
Treasons, Statute of, 491
Treaty of: the Triple Alliance, 8; Assiento, 8, 13; Westminster, 8, 9; Utrecht, 8, 12
Trial for treason, reform of, 36, 37
Triple Alliance (1717), 8, 9; (1788), 372, 373
Tucker, Abraham, and the association-theory in morals, 244, 245
Tull, Jethro, writings of, 100, 107, 108
Turkish War, 373
Turner, and his paintings, 564, 574
Turnpikes, 347, 455

Unitarians, 235
United Irishmen, 507-509
Utrecht, Treaty of, 8, 12, 156

Vaccination, 428, 429, 555, 556
Vagrancy, 135, 336-341
Vancouver, Captain, 392, 393
Vauxhall Gardens, 142
Versailles, Treaty of (first), 184; (second), 188
Vesey, Mrs., 357
Village life, 101, 102
Vimeira, battle of, 520
Vincent, George, 563
Volunteer movement in Ireland, 362; in England in 1803, 614, 615
Voss, Isaac, 58
Voyages, naval, 22, 391-393

Wages, 338-345, 602, 603, 612, 613
Walcheren expedition, 520, 537, 538
Wales: abolition of the Court of the Marches, 35
Wallis, Captain, and his voyages, 222, 223
Walpole, rule of, 5-7; foreign policy, 10, 11; as a finance Minister, 119-130; and the South Sea Company, 127-129; manners, 139; and Scottish affairs, 156-157; and the Wilmington Ministry, 172
Walton, Brian, and the Polyglot Bible, 71
Warburton, Bishop, and his "Divine Legation of Moses," 41
WARNER, G. TOWNSEND: manufacture (1714-1742), 110-117; (1742-1784), 305-326; (1784-1802), 459-474; (1802-1815), 591-604
Washington, General, and the American War of Independence, 193, 202, 203
Waste lands, 100, 453, 458
Water-colour Society, 575
Water-power, 603
Waterloo, 522, 531
Watson, Sir William, and electrical discovery, 249
Watt, James, 460-464
Weaving, 305-311, 468
Wedgwood, Josiah, porcelain of, 317-321
Wellington, Duke of, in India, 382-384; Peninsular War, 520, 521, 526, 527; Waterloo, 522
Wesley, John, and the religious awakening, 172, 237-239, 369, 410, 411
West, Benjamin, 431
Wheat, price of, 132, 337, 338, 491, 492, 609, 612
Whigs, the, ascendency of, 2, 3, 405; their schism of 1717, 4; and the Wilmington Ministry, 172; their struggle with George III., 175, 176
Whitefield, George, and his work, 238
Whitehead, William, 441
Whitelocke, expedition of, to Buenos Ayres, 540
WHITTAKER, T.: Philosophy (1714-1742), 41-45; (1742-1784), 240-250; (1784-1802), 413-415; (1802-1815), 553, 554; Science (1714-1742), 41-45; (1742-1784), 245-250; (1784-1802), 415-419; (1802-1815), 546-553
Wilberforce, William, 368, 544, 545
Wilkes, John, the affair of, 176, 178, 352
Wilkie, David, 558, 559
Wilmington's Ministry, 172
Wilson, Richard, paintings of, 277-279
Wilton, Joseph, 576
Witchcraft, abolition of Statutes against, 40; in Scotland, 167
Wolfe, General, on the English Army, 16, 17, 190; his generalship, 189; in Canada, 198-200, 378
Wollaston, William, and his ethical theories, 42
Wollaston, William Hyde, 550
Women: occupations, 101, 602; dress, 140, 141, 356, 497; intellectual improvement, 356-358
Wood, William, and the production of iron, 115, 116; and Irish halfpence, 116, 169
Woodward, William, 417
Woollen trade, 112, 113 601
Wordsworth, 446, 580-584
Workhouses, 134
Worms, Treaty of, 182
Wotton, William, and the Epistles of Phalaris, 61-63
Wright, Joseph, 430

York, Duke of, and the Dutch campaigns, 386-388
Yorktown, surrender of, 205
Young, Arthur, and agricultural progress, 453-457, 459
Young, Edward, writings of, 81, 82
Young, Thomas, and optical investigation, 550, 551

PRINTED BY CASSELL & COMPANY, LIMITED, LA BELLE SAUVAGE, LONDON E.C.

Date Due

F 28 '38

Ag 19 '43

[redacted] 83

DA110 .T76 v.5
Social England : a record of the
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00047 4231